DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 118 CG 016 812

TITLE	Problems of Runaway Youth. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary. United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, Second Session on Problems of and Services Provided for Runaway and Homeless Youth, Focusing on Support to State and Local Governments and Nonprofit Agencies for the Development of Community-Based Programs.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on the Judiciary.
REPORT NO	Senate-J-97-131
PUB DATE	22 Jul 82
NOTE	111p.; Not available in paper copy because of small print.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Block Grants; Community Programs; *Delinquency; Economic Status; Family Problems; Family Relationship; Federal Legislation; *Federal State Relationship; *Financial Needs; Hearings; Program Effectiveness; *Runaways; Secondary Education; Sexual Abuse; Youth Problems; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 97th; *Runaway and Homeless Youth Act 1974

ABSTRACT

These hearings, focusing on financial support for community-based programs dealing with problems of runaway and homeless youths, explore the scope of the problem, types of activities which are being undertaken, and paths for future action. Testimony and prepared statements are presented by several witnesses including a commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families; a detective of the District of Columbia police force; an assistant professor of law; a writer and researcher; the executive director of The Bridge over Troubled Waters Boston; the director of Youth-in Action, Chester, Pennsylvania; and the executive director of the Youth Network Council, Chicago. Testimony includes information about block grant funding, the National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth, a statement of the status and accomplishments of centers funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the sexual exploitation of children, anecdotal material concerning runaway and homeless children, and considerations of funding for programs. An appendix contains testimony of the coordinator of the Youth Services Alliance of Pennsylvania, and the executive director of Huckleberry House, Columbus, Ohio. (AG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PROBLEMS OF RUNAWAY YOUTH

ED232118

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

PROBLEMS OF AND SERVICES PROVIDED FOR RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH, FOCUSING ON SUPPORT TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND NONPROFIT AGENCIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS

JULY 22, 1982

Serial No. J-97-131

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CG016812

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
11-400 O WASHINGTON : 1983

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina, *Chairman*

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
DENNIS DeCONCINI, Arizona
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
MAX BAUCUS, Montana
HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama

VINTON DeVANE LIDE, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*
MARK H. GITENSTEIN, *Minority Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

BRUCE A. COHEN, *Chief Counsel*
MARGERY BAKER, *Minority Chief Counsel*

ED235118

CG 016815

CONTENTS

OPENING STATEMENTS

Page

Specter, Hon. Arlen, a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, chairman, Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice 1
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts 1

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Hodges, Clarence, Commissioner, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health and Human Services, accompanied by Keith Moon, Deputy Commissioner 2
Robertson, Gerald, detective, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department 43
Weisberg, D. Kelly, senior research associate, Urban and Rural Systems Associates and assistant professor, Hastings College of Law, University of California, San Francisco, Calif 48
Rader, Dotson, writer, Parade magazine, New York, N.Y 66
Whelan, Sister Barbara, executive director, The Bridge Over Troubled Waters, Inc., Boston, Mass 74
Jones, Tommie Lee, director, Youth-In Action, Chester, Pa 80
Sherman, Arnold E., executive director, Youth Network Council, Chicago, Ill 87

ALPHABETICAL LISTING AND MATERIALS SUBMITTED

Hodges, Clarence:
  Testimony 2
  Letter to Senator Specter covering requested information 6
  Prepared statement 15
  Report of the Department of Health and Human Services on the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program 27
Jones, Tommie Lee:
  Testimony 80
  Prepared statement 84
Rader, Dotson:
  Testimony 66
  Runaways, by Dotson Rader, from Parade, February 7, 1982 70
Robertson, Gerald:
  Testimony 43
  Prepared statement 46
Sherman, Arnold E.:
  Testimony 87
  Prepared statement 90
Weisberg, D. Kelly:
  Testimony 48
  Prepared statement 53
  Adolescent Prostitution: A Study of Sexual Exploitation, Etiological Factors, and Runaway Behavior with a Focus on Adolescent Male Prostitutes, from Urban and Rural Systems Associates 59
Whelan, Sister Barbara:
  Testimony 74
  Prepared statement 76
  Ex-Dropouts Stand Proud for Diplomas, from the Boston Globe, May 23, 1982, by Richard Higgins 79

APPENDIX

Page
Testimony of Herb Lawrence, coordinator, The Youth Services Alliance of Pennsylvania ... 97
Testimony of W. Douglas McCoard, executive director, Huckleberry House, Inc., Columbus, Ohio ... 104

PROBLEMS OF RUNAWAY YOUTH

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1982

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, in room 2228, Dirksen Senate Office Building, commencing at 9:30 a.m., Hon. Arlen Specter (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Staff: Bruce H. Cohen, chief counsel; William W. Treanor, professional staff member; and Rachel Brody, staff assistant.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ARLEN SPECTER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

Senator SPECTER. It being 9:30, we will commence these hearings on problems of runaway youth before this Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The problem of runaway youth is of epidemic proportions in this country, with up to 1 million such youths being involved every year. Of that number, only 44,000 are said to find their way into some sort of a program.

Last year there was a real assault on the program to help runaway youth with the House of Representatives actually repealing the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and an effort has been made by the administration to place the runaway program to block grants.

We were successful last year in retaining the runaway youth program with a separate appropriation and with the help of Senator Harrison Schmitt on the Health and Human Services Subcommittee, we were finally successful in having the sum of $10.5 million allocated, which is, while insufficient, more funds than I thought would appear for some substantial period of time.

This year the administration has put funds into the program but the recommendation is only for $6.6 million and that is hardly enough to take care of the very pressing problems that exist in this area.

[The prepared opening statement of Senator Kennedy follows:]

PREPARED OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

A great man once said that the true test of a society is how it treats those in the dawn of life, its children, those in the shadows of life, the poor and handicapped, and those in the twilight of life, the elderly. If Hubert Humphrey were here today, he would surely give this Administration an "F" for failing to pass that test.

For the last 18 months we have seen programs to protect and educate and feed children come under the budgetary meat ax. If they had their way they would end funding for programs to prevent child abuse. They would end programs to promote adoption of homeless children. They would rewrite child labor laws that protect 14-15 year olds from long hours and unsafe working conditions. They would eliminate jobs that give young people skills and income. And they would cut funding for runaway shelters by 40 percent and then turn the program back to the states. I say this is not a "turn back" but a "turn your back" program on the needs of hundreds of thousands of homeless and helpless young people who are living off the streets because they've no place to call home.

And the real tragedy is that we know how to call these children home. We know that the 1 million children who run away each year leave one nightmare behind, only to find they are living another. They flee abusive, uncaring parents and are flung into the waiting arms of pimps and pushers who lead them into a life of prostitution and drug addiction.

They aren't asking us for very much. They seek a safe haven, a warm, clean place to sleep, decent food, schooling, a job, and a friend to help them decide who they are and who they want to become.

Runaway shelters like the "Bridge" in Boston and the Centers in Newton and Springfield and Franklin, Massachusetts and others around the country, offer these young people a chance to leave the streets, and go straight. They offer help to reunite the teenager and his family. And most of all they offer hope. But only 4 percent of the children who run away each year receive this help. Only 44,000 of the million who leave home are given this second chance. The Administration's budget calls for cutting back even more.

What about the others who never make it to a shelter. Who cares about them? Where is their second chance? Where is their hope? What will become of them? Surely the richest, most generous, most compassionate nation in the world can do better for its own children.

Senator SPECTER. Today we have a series of witnesses to explore the scope of the problem, the types of activities which are being undertaken to deal with it, to get some idea of how to proceed in the future.

We are pleased to welcome this morning Commissioner Clarence Hodges from the Department of Health and Human Services. He is in the Administration for Children, Youth and Families and with him is Mr. Keith Moon, the Deputy Commissioner.

Gentlemen, if you would, please come forward. We are pleased to hear from you at this time.

We appreciate your submitting a statement for the record. That will be submitted for the record in accordance with the custom of the subcommittee. We would appreciate it if you would summarize your statement, leaving the maximum amount of time for questions.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE HODGES, COMMISSIONER, ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES, OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ACCOMPANIED BY KEITH MOON, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES, OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Mr. HODGES. It is an honor and a pleasure for me to appear before this distinguished subcommittee and knowing of your interest in this great problem of homeless and runaway youth. Assisting me in this capacity is Mr. Keith Moon who has experience in this area and, as you have suggested, I will not read the entire presentation that has been prepared for my remarks but I would just say that I have some very positive information and very good experiences that I have seen as I have traveled around this great country of ours with what is happening with children and youth There are some terrible things happening but there are some improvements taking place.

There is a serious problem of child abuse and neglect and at the same time we see some of our young people excelling in a number of areas.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will just say that I am pleased to appear before this subcommittee at any time it is requested, as I have pledged on previous occasions, it is an honor for me to be here and I trust that I can be of benefit to you today.

Senator SPECTER. Just how would you summarize the scope of the seriousness of the problem of runaways at the present time? Start with the figure which my staff has presented to me, upwards of 1 million youth a year. How many are there?

Mr. HODGES. It is our firm belief that there are approximately 1 million runaway youths per year.

Senator SPECTER. That is a very round figure. How do we come to that figure? How reliable is that figure? Is it just a speculation, a guess, or do we have some basis for that calculation?

Mr. HODGES. Senator, this figure has been compiled from a number of sources, utilizing sources from the Justice Department, police departments, those agencies that are serving youth, those that we find in other agencies. Our contact with these agencies suggests to us that this is a fairly decent number, though it probably is not exact. But it is a reliable number on which we can say there are 1 million per year. There was a study made back in 1975 and that study seems to support as much and our current contacts with our network around the country indicates that the problem is at least as severe. These children are being put out by natural parents in many cases and/or they are runaways.

Senator SPECTER. You are saying shut out, put out?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct, by their natural parents in many cases. Many are running away from foster homes, from institutions. There are those that cannot cope with——

Senator SPECTER. When you say being put out, Commissioner, you mean there is a calculated effort by parents to simply exclude the children from households? It does not arise exclusively as a matter of some conflict between parent and child but there is a deliberate effort by some parents to exclude their children?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct. There are those parents that order their children to leave the home. There are those parents that change the locks on the doors. There are those parents that move away and do not tell their children. Many of these children are adolescents, teenagers, pregnant expectant mothers, and many times when these young people need help most, they receive the least amount of support from some of their families because, to a great extent, the families are not capable of coping with the stress.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Hodges, what sanctions are available for parents who do that sort of thing, that change the locks? Now you are talking about minor children, children, say, under the age of 18?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct

Senator SPECTER. Are there any criminal sanctions?

Mr. HODGES. Yes, Senator, and there are those persons who have been properly prosecuted for such. It has been difficult because to force people to keep their children does not provide the best home for the children. Many of these children end up in foster care, particularly when they are below the teens.

Senator SPECTER. I have had some experience in prosecutions but I have never seen a case where a parent was prosecuted for excluding a child from the home, changing a lock and that is why I asked the question. I know of no provision, say, in the Pennsylvania code which would provide a sanction. But, as you describe the nature of the problem, it crosses my mind there ought to be such a sanction. It may well be that the home would not be a very good one, where the parent wants to lock out the child. But that that home may be well better than the street or, if there is a sanction and if the law is enforced, it may deter some parents who would be so inclined and find some alternative course of conduct.

Mr. HODGES. The only course of action that I have known that has been used has been to pursue the issue of support, nonsupport, and those families that have responsibilities for supporting their children, some of them have been prosecuted for nonsupport, who have chosen not to be supportive of the children. You are correct; it is a very serious problem and some of them would be better off in their homes but a great number of these do what is best in leaving the home, sad to say, because many are abused in their homes, abused physically, sexually, mentally, and the suffering that takes place with these young people—some lives are damaged forever almost. They need services so they can be brought around.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Hodges, is there any statistical estimate as to how many juveniles are locked out of their homes?

Mr. HODGES. There would be, of those that we are seeking, in the vicinity of up to one-third.

Senator SPECTER. A third of what?

Mr. HODGES. A third of the numbers that are runaways.

Senator SPECTER. A third of the 1 million are locked out of their homes?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct, Senator

Senator SPECTER. How many such cases have you seen yourself?

Mr. HODGES. I have been involved, to some extent, in working with young people for the past 20 years as a volunteer, and as a professional, I have worked in many camps and given my vacations to work with children in camps. I have seen many there. I have seen countless hundreds. Some I have been big brother to and some informal uncles to and I have seen the problem of locked out and abused children. There are hundreds of thousands out there. Many I have seen myself.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Hodges, I would appreciate it if you could provide the committee with a survey of the laws which are available to impose sanctions on parents who lock out their children. I would like to know what States have statutes which deal with that specific problem and I would also like to have the benefit of your reflection on the subject as to what this committee or your Department or the Congress could do on this subject. It would be an unusual and probably inappropriate exercise of Federal police power to legislate on this subject. But this is one where we ought to direct our attention, to see what efforts are being made on the State level and what is doable at the Federal level because, as you describe this problem, it is a very intense one.

Mr. Hodges. We shall be happy to do that and I think it would be very valuable information that can be used and we will supply that.

[Requested material follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of
Human Development Services

Administration for
Children, Youth and Families
Washington DC 20201

The Honorable Arlen Specter
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Juvenile Justice
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Specter:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to your request made during the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act Oversight Hearings regarding information about State laws that can be invoked against parents who lock out or push out their children. You also requested information on existing block grants in terms of State use of funds for administrative cost and for services to minorities. We have sought information from several sources on both issues and have an adequate understanding of the present situation.

On the first issue, all States have laws against contributing to the delinquency of a minor. This remedy can be used where children are forced or urged to leave home. However, it is most often used where adults engage children in unlawful activities. Secondly, general non-support statutes can be invoked in response to a complaint or action by a parent, the police, prosecuting attorney, or a protective service agency. In either case, once a court gets involved, a judge can order appropriate remedies; some States provide for incarceration where such orders are ignored. Some judges have ordered parents to allow a child's return to the home where there was no physical or emotional danger indicated. This is usually to give the child another chance while other support services are utilized to effect positive changes in the family's or child's behavior.

Where another environment is determined better for the child, parents can be and have been ordered to pay the cost of such placement outside the home. However, they are never required to pay the full cost when the cost is extraordinary.

I have personally talked with county prosecutors and did not detect a willingness to prosecute parents, except where there is child abuse or criminal neglect. The usual practice is to utilize other supportive services to help strengthen the family and involve the children in positive activities. Police Athletic Clubs, Big Brothers/Sisters and other volunteer agencies often combine their efforts with juvenile officers and other public agencies.

We have just completed our first full year of experience with the block grants. While we do not have detailed information on specific costs under the block grants, we have engaged the States and Federal regional officials in obtaining as much information as possible.

One of our sources of information is an analysis of pre-expenditure reports submitted by the States. We have also received information through surveys conducted by the National Governors' Association, the National Urban League and a study conducted by the GAO. In addition, we have obtained anecdotal information through discussions with State officials.

The 1982 Governor's Guide to Block Grant Implementation, prepared by the National Governors' Association, contains a summary of State responses to a question about changes they had made in administration to manage the block grants.

Twenty-five States indicated they had not had time to make significant changes to remove or simplify administrative burdens for FY 1982. They also indicated they are actively considering possible changes in FY 1983.

We have looked specifically at the concerns of racial minorities. The National Urban League has studied the issue extensively with a monitoring task force in almost every State. They are reporting no serious problems regarding citizen involvement or allocation of funds.

We have additional anecdotal information on some changes made by States this year. Some States are increasing State level administrative activity to improve efficient use of funds, while other States hope to achieve the same goal by decreasing these activities. A number of States have either reduced or plan to reduce regulatory requirements for their service providers. In contrast, Pennsylvania is imposing additional requirements so that it can monitor expenditures more closely. Connecticut and Wyoming are looking to management information system improvement to increase management efficiency.

In regard specifically to the Social Services Block Grant, administered by the Office of Human Development Services, States made or are planning to make changes in social services management. Oregon has decided to make "mini-block grants" to counties and area agencies on aging for adult and aging services.

This consolidation is expected to reduce administrative costs. Pennsylvania is providing mini-block grants for aging services to give local governments flexibility in setting priorities and designing delivery mechanisms. It is also consolidating its social services block grant and aging services, with a single set of State regulations and reporting requirements.

As you can see, at this point we have only descriptive information on how the States are using block grant funds. We do expect to receive additional information, as States provide post-expenditure reports and further pre-expenditure reports.

Given the small amount of time the States have had to prepare for and implement the block grants, we believe that these programs have been implemented smoothly.

I trust this information is of value to you and the subcommittee. I deeply appreciate your support and I am always pleased to cooperate.

Sincerely,

Clarence E Hodges

Clarence E. Hodges
Commissioner

Senator **Specter**. The statistics which are provided by staff here are that some 44,000 young people are the beneficiaries of services, those who run away. Do you know whether that is an accurate figure and, if so, what the basis for this calculation is?

Mr. **Hodges**. We have a reporting system where those agencies that we support, particularly with Federal funds, do feed to us information as to whom they are serving and we are confident that that figure is a solid figure, 44,000 receiving some comprehensive services. There are still others, about 133,000, that receive other services that are less comprehensive and then another 200,000 that receive some telephone services where we seek to connect families and youths, even before they reach our centers in person but they may call in on our hotline.

Senator **Specter**. When you describe comprehensive services available to the 44,000, what do those comprehensive services include?

Mr. **Hodges**. These services include visiting, person to person, one on one, in group counseling sessions or individual counseling sessions and temporary lodging. They may include visits to the home in an effort to get the young person back into the family. They may include placement efforts with getting the person placed into a foster care home, if that is the proper service needed. Linking them into other services that are supposed to be serving children and youth. They would also include aftercare, once the child is reunited with the family, to provide the supportive strength that a family may need in order to keep this problem from reoccurring. It often does but we are pleased that we have a high percentage of success from the kind of centers that are operating around the country and in spite of the fact that there are resources that are not unlimited, they do have quality staff, capable, competent, dedicated persons and they are making a difference.

Senator **Specter**. Under whose auspices are these centers run?

Mr. **Hodges**. These centers, some are run by States. Most are run by nonprofit organizations.

Senator **Specter**. None are run by the Department of Health and Human Services?

Mr. **Hodges**. That is right. We do not operate any directly. We provide assistance to. Not any of these are supported totally by Federal funds. They all use other funds to a great extent and they show what can be done when resources are pulled together from a variety of sources.

Senator **Specter**. What kind of support typically would you supply, say, to a private organization?

Mr. **Hodges**. We may supply, say, $35,000 to an agency.

Senator **Specter**. You make that grant. Applications are made to the Department of Health and Human Services. You evaluate and you make that grant?

Mr. **Hodges**. That is correct. Their application would come in, if they are not already funded, and there would be an evaluation and determination as to what part of the fund should be Federal funds and we would make that kind of grant and follow through on the services, the quality, provide technical assistance to help them succeed.

Senator SPECTER. How big is your unit within the Department of Health and Human Services?

Mr. HODGES. The Administration for Children, Youth and Families has a staff of—total Federal staff in both our national office and the 10 regional offices which are approximately 400, maybe just a little short of 400. The total budget is about $1.5 billion. Most of this money, however, is for Head Start. But Head Start is a program that helps to prevent these kinds of problems we are talking about today, child abuse, child neglect, runaways, throw away youth.

Senator SPECTER. Well, Head Start is essentially an educational program, is it not?

Mr. HODGES. Education is a major factor but it is a multiapproach program where we serve not just one child that is in Head Start. We serve the entire family. We provide courses in parenting skills that go for 20 weeks. We serve the entire family. We seek to move them from poverty to self-sufficiency. It is a total family program and as such it helps to prevent child abuse and neglect and it helps the family to cope with stress which often provokes people to do cruel things to children.

Senator SPECTER. When you talk about the 44,000 that are served in a comprehensive way, are those 44,000 served by the Head Start aspect?

Mr. HODGES. No, sir. These are not served by Head Start. These are served strictly by our runaway centers.

Senator SPECTER. How many people are served through the $1.5 billion which includes Head Start?

Mr. HODGES. For Head Start we service 377,000 children and this would amount to about the same number of families. When we look at those families containing about three children each, that is the kind of service we are giving in that particular area. We also provide services and training for child welfare programs in every State and assist those States in providing these services to children who are threatened and we provide adoption assistance, foster care services. There are 500,000 children in foster care, separated from their natural parents, and some of these foster care homes are excellent but many of them are not. We seek to make sure they are being given the best service. We seek to unite families where appropriate and where that is not appropriate, that child needs something permanent and we would hope to assist in adopting services so there is a lot of security for every child in America.

Senator SPECTER. On the program which is funded to the extent of $1.5 billion, can you give me the approximate funding level for fiscal year 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983?

Mr. HODGES. The funding levels are about level for 1981, 1982; Head Start being the largest one which would come to $911 million for 1982 and for 1983 about $912 million, is what we have been looking at, though we are not really certain about the total budget for 1983.

Senator SPECTER. Do you know what 1981 was?

Mr. HODGES. Yes, 1981 was $818 million.

Senator SPECTER. Where does the balance come in for the total of $1.5 billion then?

Mr. **Hodges**. We have about $500 million going to the areas of child welfare services, child welfare training, adoption assistance, foster care; foster care being the largest, getting about $300 million.

Senator **Specter**. How much of that, if any, is administered through a block grant program?

Mr. **Hodges**. At this point in time none of that goes to block grant.

Senator **Specter**. Has there been any proposal to put that in the block grant?

Mr. **Hodges**. Child welfare—there is a proposed child welfare block grant which would block child welfare services and training, adoption assistance and foster care. This has been proposed, that it be blocked, because where it is now categorical, with only $5 million for adoption assistance and $300 million for foster care, it suggests to the casual observer that the emphasis is on foster care when the children need permanent and adoption assistance with flexibility so each State would have the ability to put more where it is needed, whether it is in training or adoption assistance or foster care.

Senator **Specter**. Commissioner Hodges, what is your overall philosophical view of the desirability of putting more programs into block grants as opposed to the categorical approach?

Mr. **Hodges**. I think the flexibility per State is extremely important, Senator. If a person is given $300 to buy food; $100 to buy vegetables, $100 to buy fruit, and $100 to buy paper products, they might need a different mix and if you would say to the same person, you can take $250 and mix it as you wish, they would be able to do a more intelligent purchase and we believe this. Particularly my concern is we would like to see more available for adoption assistance so that these children can have the love and security of an adoptive family instead of staying in foster care, as some move to 10 and even 20 foster care homes in their lifetime.

Senator **Specter**. When you say you would like more in adoption services, there you put your finger on the problem. You have a view from your experience as to what you think the priorities should be. If you put it into block grants, then you leave it to State administrators. I have great concern as laws are administered in 50 States unevenly, with different perspectives and different cultural backgrounds and different historical perspective, that the value which has been defined on the Federal level may not be respected. I know there is no short answer to that but let me formulate the question this way.

Do you have confidence in the administration of the States to carry out the lines which have been defined and identified as important national goals?

Mr. **Hodges**. I would think, Senator, that we would have to give them some guidelines. Each State may have a different need for a mix within the State and to give them that flexibility with guidelines. The protections that have been built-in already are assuring these services, the kinds of guidelines and guidance and regulations that have been issued——

Senator SPECTER. How tight are the guidelines? How much delineation and specification do you give them in the guidelines? If you give enough guidelines, you become categorical.

Mr. HODGES. That is correct, if there were excessive guidelines. But even the amount of guidelines we have with the categorical programs—the guidelines could remain to insure, for instance, that there is the periodic review—that every child is accounted for, that every child's case is reviewed and that every effort is made for permanency. These kinds of guidelines would not prevent the flexibility of use between foster care and adoption assistance.

Senator SPECTER. Under the block grant, if they cut adoption assistance, which from your vantage point you consider the most important and they could put the funds elsewhere if the blocks are sufficiently broad—how do you feel about that?

Mr. HODGES. I would be opposed to putting them any place else other than these. The standards that have been indicated, the legislation that we have had in the past on these issues, have made very clear some standards that have been determined by the Congress. At the same time the Department of Health and Human Services has issued regulations to protect and I would think that the same kinds of protection would help to insure that each child was accounted for, that he was served individually, that he did receive the necessary periodic review and that he did receive the best service that was available for that child.

Senator SPECTER. How much experience have you had with the administration of block grants as of this moment?

Mr. HODGES. Not a whole lot of experience, Senator, in that block grants are fairly new. But the only issue that I have seen from both the State and local levels, as well as from this level at this time, is that the flexibility——

Senator SPECTER. Well, we put some block grants into operation as of October 1, 1981, right?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct.

Senator SPECTER. Put quite a few in. Have we had sufficient experience in the past 9½ months to draw any conclusions about how well the block grants are working out as well as to the discretionary exercise by the State?

Mr. HODGES. Those block grants have been out of my area, Senator, and I have not had the personal opportunity to have a close look but in some cases our programs have touched and we have had a mix of responses from those being served.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Hodges, I would appreciate it if you would take a look at what block grants have been in effect since October 1, 1981, and give me your view, nothing elaborate, but if you could identify the block grants which you take a look at and answer the question—two questions I am specifically concerned with: No. 1, what has been the quality of the discretion of the States in making allocations as they itemize priorities with your own view, with particular emphasis on minorities and disadvantaged and blacks and hispanics, to see how those groups have fared under the block grant approach, whether the national priorities and goals for those groups which have been built up over the past many years have been respected; and the second area of concern I have is how much administrative cost has been siphoned off at the State level without actually getting down to the operational units, which is concern I hear when I travel through Pennsylvania. The agencies frequently say, we are concerned about the block grants, as to what the administrative costs will be at the State level.

Mr. HODGES. I will pull this information together for you, Senator, and we will supply that to you.

Senator SPECTER. In just a few more minutes, Mr. Hodges, I would like to focus on the runaway youth program, the Runaway Youth Act and the appropriation of some $10.5 million. Recognizing that you are an employee in the executive branch, nonetheless, I want your evaluations as to the adequacy of that appropriation for the problem that you face.

Mr. HODGES. Thank you, Senator. I have been very much concerned about this and all the other programs and about the adequacy of funding, the levels of service, the quality of service that will be maintained. I have visited many of our centers. I have written to every center that we fund. I have asked how they are being affected. I have asked what creative ways they are using to respond to the economic conditions of this time period.

It is my intention to share with all these centers all the successes and the innovative methods that are being used to overcome financial problems.

Senator SPECTER. Your last sentence omits failures. Is there none?

Mr. HODGES. Of all the responses I have received, they have all been positive.

Senator SPECTER. You have enough money at $10.5 million?

Mr. HODGES. Their point is we can always use more money.

Senator SPECTER. I am sure of that. But is $10.5 million reasonably adequate?

Mr. HODGES. In the regular kinds of programs we operate, if the runaway youth centers were in that way, federally funded programs, then that would not be. But these programs operate to a greater extent with other funds than with funds from this agency. They utilize to a greater extent volunteers that are serving directly. Their abilities to raise funds because of the mix is enhanced. I have even been pleasantly surprised, that the United Way funding is increasing for many of these agencies and corporate contributions, and we are giving assistance in this area. This $6.6 million is not the total amount of money we are giving to the centers. We are in the process of establishing 10 regional resource centers and these centers we have already given direction; approximately $1 million of the funds going to those centers will be for the benefit of runaway youth centers. We are already allocating a part of our staff in the effort of assisting with fund raising for these various centers around the country. So the cut we see is not nearly as severe as it would appear without understanding our other efforts in the interest of children who are served by these centers.

Senator SPECTER. Chief Counsel whispers in my ear that with $10.5 million, that service is being given only to 6.6 percent—about 7 percent of the runaway youth. Would you agree with that statistic?

Mr. HODGES. I would say that sounds about—I would not have any reason to disagree with that.

Senator SPECTER. That being so, Commissioner Hodges, how can we conclude that that is adequate?

Mr. HODGES. Well, there are a number of other centers that do not use any of our funds and we provide some assistance to those. We are available to provide particularly technical assistance, intake, development processes, systems. We provide that kind of assistance. There are many—a number of institutions—there are many churches even that provide that kind of help and services that are outside of our basic primary network. They are being served by other agencies.

Senator SPECTER. When you say that you are providing other funds, are you suggesting that the funds come from a different category in addition to those under the Runaway Youth Act?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct, Senator. We have—as the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, there are many functions we have and particularly as we fund discretionary programs out of our total discretionary funds.

Senator SPECTER. How much money is going to this particular line?

Mr. HODGES. Well, the $6.6 million—that would be the total separated just for that. However, the regional resource centers are funded at $3.5 million and we have directed that a minimum——

Senator SPECTER. $3.5 million?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct, Senator.

Senator SPECTER. How much discretionary funds does the Secretary have to apply as he sees fit?

Mr. HODGES. I do not know the total amount the Secretary has, but the Office of Human Development Services has about $35 million.

Senator SPECTER. That is the Department of——

Mr. HODGES. The Office of Human Development Services headed by Assistant Secretary Hardy includes the Administration for Children, Youth and Families.

Senator SPECTER. $35 million?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct, Senator.

Senator SPECTER. But you have a tremendous number of branches that you have to allocate that money among?

Mr. HODGES. That is correct. There are many special research programs and special institutions of higher education. We are seeking to stretch every dollar to the limit, to utilize resources, volunteers, student placement services where students work and learn in our facilities. This is being included and even military installations are providing the same kind of resources and support.

Senator SPECTER. In summation, Mr. Hodges, do you think that $10.5 million is adequate last year and $6.6 million is adequate next year?

Mr. HODGES. I would think that these figures will provide a tremendous benefit for the young people that are caught up in this problem of homeless and runaway youth. There probably always will be at least one more that could use some service and we are seeking to never turn away a young person and to make sure that this can be done. I am confident that the funding level presently proposed in these programs, as I have received correspondence from most of these agencies—that we can continue to provide a high quality of service and make a real difference in the life of these young people.

Senator SPECTER. Well, you have not come to grips directly with the question of adequacy and perhaps you cannot. You have used the language of tremendous benefit. So I take it that your overall view is given the overall funding problems of the Federal Government, these figures are within the realm of realism and appropriateness. You are not here today to lobby for more money.

Mr. HODGES. No, sir; I am not.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I very much appreciate your testimony, Commissioner Hodges. I look over your biographical resume and you have a very distinguished record and you certainly approach these problems articulately and thoughtfully.

Mr. HODGES. Thank you very much, Senator. I understand that my written testimony will be included in the record.

Senator SPECTER. Yes, sir, it shall be.

Mr. HODGES. We shall be available at any time for you and the staff.

Senator SPECTER. Deputy Commissioner Moon, we kept you silently at the table. Do you want to be a member of the silent majority?

Mr. MOON. I have no statement, Mr. Chairman. I would be very happy to answer any additional questions.

Senator SPECTER. Is there anything you disagree with Commissioner Hodges on?

Mr. MOON. No, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hodges and the report of the Department of Health and Human Services on the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CLARENCE HODGES

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I am Clarence Hodges, Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families in the Office of Human Development Services within the Department of Health and Human Services.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss with you one of the important services provided young people in this Nation, that is, the National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth.

As Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families I have had the opportunity to visit programs for runaway and homeless youth and their families across the Nation and I am deeply committed to improving the quality of these programs and to assuring that the needs of these youth are met. We are all aware of the fact that runaway and homeless youth are a vulnerable part of our youth population and it is our intention to continue to operate programs which will effectively address their needs.

The National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth, as administered by the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, provides support to State and local governments, non-profit agencies, and coordinated networks of these agencies for the development and strengthening of community-based programs that address the immediate needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families. The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act requires that these centers be located outside the law enforcement structure and the juvenile justice system. In addition, the statute authorizes funds for a National Communications System to assist youth in communicating with their families and with youth service providers.

The National Statistical Survey on Runaway Youth, conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in 1975, found that approximately

733,000 youth each year are either runaways or are directed to leave home by their parents. We have no reasons to believe that this number has decreased in subsequent years.

The centers funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act have the responsibility to reunite runaway and homeless youth with their families or to provide placements in appropriate alternative living situations -- for example, foster, group or relatives' homes -- for those youth who cannot return home.

Community-based, imaginative, and above all, flexible centers throughout the nation are providing a nontraditional service for runaway, homeless and troubled youth and their families. These centers do not have an easy task. They are dealing with young people who are particularly vulnerable and who might otherwise fall prey to perilous elements. Their needs cannot be ignored. They need counseling, a place to live, food, medical care, legal advice, and a wide range of other essential services.

We have seen a significant change in the population served over the years since the national program has been in operation. Today young people who are runaways or who are forced to leave their homes--whether it is because they are abused, rejected by their families, or encountering problems with schools, drugs, alcohol, or friends--do not go as far away from their homes or communities as they once did. This has important implications for the community-based nature of these centers. By their location and their orientation they are better able to help young people in the communities where their problems arise, and are also better able to work with their families and make it possible for them to return home.

The Administration has committed $6.6 million for services to runaway and homeless youth in the next fiscal year. Although this is a lower funding level than in the preceding year, it is in keeping with the resource constraints that all Federal agencies and programs are facing. I emphasize, however, that this does not represent any lowering in commitment by ACYF, the Department or the Administration to the needs of the Nation's runaway and homeless youth. I strongly believe that ACYF, by providing the leadership, guidance and creativity, can preserve the integrity and viability of runaway and homeless youth programs as service providers.

Our data indicates that about 10.4% or 4,600 of the 44,000 youth receiving shelter in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program during 1981 were returned to foster care as the best possible placement available. In addition, about 72% of these children were returned to their own homes, or to the homes of friends or relatives.

Funds administered by ACYF for the support of the runaway and homeless youth centers are allocated on the basis of a State formula, as required by the Act. Specifically, the provision encompasses the total youth population under age 18 in each State in proportion to all of the States. ACYF administers the funds through our ten Departmental Regional Offices, having awarded $10.2 million in grants to 169 centers located throughout the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in FY 1981. These centers sheltered and provided long-term counseling to approximately 44,000 youth, and a variety of other one-time, drop-in services to approximately 133,000 youth and their families.

In addition to providing direct financial support for the operation of the centers, ACYF activities also encompass:

-- operating the National Runaway Switchboard to assist approximately 200,000 runaway and homeless youth in communicating with their families and with youth service providers

-- providing information and technical assistance to State policy makers on the issues of runaway and homeless youth, abused and neglected youth, adolescent substance abuse and juvenile justice

-- sponsoring eight grants to coordinated networks of centers and other agencies resulting in increased effectiveness in providing training, decreased dependence on Federal funds, expansion of services, and increased grantee participation in State-wide services planning

-- supporting research and demonstration activities to test new service models and to assess changes in the characteristics and service requirements of center clients over time

-- participating in collaborative efforts with Federal, State and local units of government and the private, volunteer sectors to improve services to vulnerable youth and their families

During Fiscal Year 1982, the centers are receiving continuation funding under a non-competitive review process based upon satisfactory performance. Similarly, the National Communications System has been refunded.

Each of the centers funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act during FY 1981 received funding from sources other than the Department of Health and Human Services. Included were combinations of Federal, State, county, and city funding, as well as contributions from the private and voluntary sectors. For example, the individual budgets of the runaway and homeless youth centers range from $22,730 to $588,841, with an average budget of $165,652. The Youth Development Bureau makes grants directly to the centers which range from $8,500 to $150,000, with an average funding level of $51,694. In 1981, Runaway and Homeless Youth Act funds comprised about one-third of the average budget of the runaway and homeless youth centers.

I am particularly pleased that many centers have made extensive use of volunteers in addressing the needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families. For example, The Bridge Program in Boston uses volunteer doctors and nurses to staff its Medical Van which travels to the neighborhoods where young people congregate; and volunteer dentists and dental assistants staff its dental clinic. The Safe Space Station Program in Cleveland, Ohio uses trained volunteers as nurses, attorneys, art therapists, medical staff and technicians. Trained volunteer parents in the Philadelphia area offer their homes for runaway children as a part of the Voyage House Program in Pennsylvania, and volunteers also staff its hotline. The National Communications System, which operates 24-hours a day, utilizes more than 100 trained volunteers to provide information, referral, and counseling services to the young people and parents who contact it for assistance. Runaway youth centers have an average of 15 volunteers providing counseling and other services to runaway and homeless youth. In most centers, volunteers comprise a three to one ratio to every paid staff person.

Knowing of this Subcommittee's interest that the Department work closely with other agencies, I am pleased to inform you that we are in the process of developing a number of collaborative activities. One example is an initiative that utilizes foster grandparents in the provision of aftercare services to runaway and homeless youth.

Additional examples of the creativity being utilized to maintain the quality and quantity of services provided to runaway and homeless youth are available, and I would like to give just a few. The Mountain Plains Coalition, headquartered in South Dakota, for example, is establishing a community foundation in order to supplement the Federal funds that it receives to serve runaway and homeless youth. New Life Services in Cincinnati, Ohio has been successful in securing private sector industrial support for its youth employment program, which is an important funding source for its total program of services to youth. The Youth Network Council of Chicago has implemented a policy of seeking reimbursement from the parents of youth who can afford to pay for the services received. Furthermore, all of these community service agencies report that they place great reliance on the use of volunteers throughout their entire range of program activities.

Mr. Chairman, we have been especially interested in the Congressional intent on networking as set forth in the 1977 amendments to the legislation and are pursuing with National, State and local government organizations and agencies, the creation of mechanisms at the State and local levels for the more effective coordination of efforts to provide services to runaway and homeless youth and their families. We provided funds for eight coordinated networking demonstration projects to assist our grantees in establishing or strengthening formal relationships with other human service providers, legislators, and private and voluntary sectors. We have also entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Conference of State Legislatures to complement the activities underway in the eight demonstrations and to support the decision-making capacity of State legislatures in the area of youth services. This collaborative arrangement with the National Conference of State Legislatures has and will continue to lead to:

-- sharing interdisciplinary information on services to vulnerable youth and their families with State legislatures, State and local governments, and the private and voluntary sectors

- processes for systematically gathering and disseminating information on exemplary, cost-effective models for serving runaway and homeless youth

The Administration for Children, Youth and Families has also been active in supporting the work of the Federal Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, created under the provisions of Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. By statute the Department is represented on the Council by the Secretary, myself and the Director of the Youth Development Bureau. We are actively involved, in concert with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and other Federal Executive Branch agencies, in developing a workplan of activities to carry through to the expiration of the legislation in October 1984.

This workplan contains four priority areas: schools and delinquency, substance abuse, treatment alternatives, and youth development. In March of this year the Department of Health and Human Services hosted three days of public hearings on developing the Council's workplan and heard testimony from some of the Nation's most prestigious organizations and officials.

In addition to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families also administers the Youth Research and Development Program which is designed to fill priority information needs related to runaway and homeless youth as well as to broader youth development issues and concerns. The efforts related to runaway and homeless youth are designed to strengthen planning as well as policy and program development relative to the administration of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act at both the local project and the National program levels. The efforts related to broader youth development issues are focused on increasing the existing knowledge base on critical and/or emerging youth needs and problems and also on effective service strategies for impacting upon these needs. Examples of the efforts conducted under this program include the following:

-- A comprehensive, 19-month evaluation of the Runaway Youth Program which documented the effectiveness of the 20 centers studied in addressing the immediate needs of youth during the runaway episode, in resolving intrafamily problems, in promoting stable, living conditions for youth, and in helping youth decide upon a future course of action in dealing with their problems other than running away. Additionally, the evaluation documented the effectiveness of the centers in generating additional revenue sources beyond those awarded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

-- Research and demonstration initiatives focused on youth and family needs and problems not previously addressed at the Federal or state levels. These efforts have significantly expanded both the knowledge base regarding these specific problems as well as the state-of-art in providing social services to prevent or ameliorate these problems. The youth problem areas addressed by these initiatives include adolescent maltreatment; families experiencing crises related to marital transition; and juvenile prostitution and sexual exploitation. These initiatives have resulted in the development. implementation, and testing of model service approaches designed to impact upon these youth problems and in the wide dissemination of the information and publications developed under these efforts to states, communities, and private sector youth-serving agencies and organizations.

YDB currently has two initiatives in progress which were initially supported in FY 1980 and will be completed in 1982. These include:

-- Demonstration grants designed to test innovative service approaches for addressing the needs of abused and neglected youth (four projects) and separated/divorced/recombined families in which a youth resides (four projects). The models being tested were developed under research initiatives previously supported by the Bureau; and

-- Family research grants, conducted by five centers for runaway and homeless youth, designed to identify those services which were or would have been of assistance to both youth and their parents before, during and subsequent to the runaway episode.

In FY 1982, the Youth Development Bureau has been involved in the review of the research and demonstration projects specific to youth needs and problems which have been submitted for potential support under the new discretionary funding program initiated by the Office of Human Development Services. These proposed projects have been reviewed by qualified panelists representing state and local agencies, higher education, National organizations, and the public, private and voluntary sectors.

It is anticipated that YDB will be involved in supporting research and demonstration initiatives related to the following areas identified as priorities in the OHDS 1982 Discretionary Program Announcement:

-- Assisting State and Local Governments in Reviewing and Modifying Standards and Licensing Practices - these projects will address the development, assessment, utilization and monitoring of model licensing requirements and standards in residential facilities, such as correctional institutions for youth

-- Volunteers - these projects will focus upon the development of new approaches for increasing the number and use of volunteers, including youth, in such areas as direct services and the development of innovative alternatives to service delivery (e.g., networking and new management techniques)

-- Family Centered Preventive Social Services Modalities - these projects will focus upon innovative approaches for enhancing the capacities of families and communities to cope with, support and intervene in coordination with formal social service systems on behalf of various target populations, including families with a youth member who is returning from an institutional or another type of residential setting

-- Research on Forms of Abuse and Neglect - these projects are designed to address the prevention and treatment of problems associated with adolescent prostitution and the sexual exploitation of youth. Particular emphasis will be placed upon the coordination of efforts between community service providers, outreach, training and community education to address the special needs and problems of these youth

The Youth Development Bureau has recently completed a two year research project focused upon juvenile prostitution, designed to provide an in-depth knowledge base on adolescent males involved in prostitution; and to identify the special needs of male and female adolescent prostitutes and social service approaches for working with these youth. One of the major outcomes of this project has been the development of a Resource Manual designed for community policy makers and service providers which presents both extensive information on the needs of these youth as well as programmatic approaches for working with the juvenile prostitute.

There are also wide variations in the characteristics, needs, problems, and backgrounds of adolescents involved in prostitution. No valid and reliable data exist which provide an accurate measurement of the number of juveniles involved in prostitution. Based upon the information generated by this research project, however, which included the development of demographic profiles on a sample of youth involved in prostitution, the "typical" adolescent male prostitute could be described as:

- 17 years old
- white
- from a lower-middle to middle income family
- from a broken home
- the victim of considerable emotional and physical abuse as well as some sexual abuse by family members
- a high school drop-out by grade 10
- unskilled and unemployed at a legitimate job
- increasingly gay- or sexual-minority-identified
- a runaway by age 15 due to family conflicts, often centering around his sexuality
- initially resorting to hustling by age 16
- motivated by the money but also, increasingly, by sexual gratification and the social life
- a street hustler
- a regular user of marijuana and alcohol
- rarely involved in pornography
- heavily involved with the juvenile justice system, primarily for larcenous offenses, and
- increasingly reliant on the social service system for housing and employment assistance.

The national profile of the adolescent male prostitute is similar in many respects to that of his female counterpart drawn from several recent urban studies. With comparably diverse backgrounds, the adolescent females distinguish themselves along a number of important dimensions. The female profile:

- is somewhat (about a year) younger than the male
- has suffered greater physical and sexual abuse in the home
- is more likely to have run away
- is almost exclusively heterosexual, in contrast to the increasing gay identification among males
- begins prostituting slightly (one year) earlier
- is controlled--personally, socially, as well as vocationally--by a pimp in return for his general support, as contrasted with the male "free-lance" operation and gay male subculture association
- views prostitution and its sexual aspects more negatively than males
- uses narcotics more often
- suffers greater violence as a prostitute, at the hands of pimps, customers, and strangers
- requires more medical services, attendant to pregnancy and physical abuse; but
- is less likely to need housing assistance.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to reaffirm to you and to the other members of the Subcommittee the commitment of the Department of Health and Human Services, as well as my personal dedication to serving this Nation's runaway and homeless youth. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify today before this distinguished Subcommittee, and will be pleased to answer any questions that you might have.

FY 1981 ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON THE STATUS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE CENTERS FUNDED UNDER THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

Title III of the Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974
(P.L. 93-415), as amended by
the Juvenile Justice Amendments
of 1977 (P.L. 95-115) and the
Juvenile Justice Amendments
of 1980 (P.L. 96-509)

Submitted By:

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Office of Human Development Services
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Youth Development Bureau

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 315 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 5715, requires that the Secretary of Health and Human Services report to the Congress annually on the status and accomplishments of the centers funded under the Act. This annual report on Fiscal Year 1981 activities of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program is submitted in response to this legislative requirement.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415), as amended,* authorizes grants to address the immediate needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families outside the law enforcement structure and the juvenile justice system. These grants may be awarded to public and private non-profit agencies, or networks of such agencies, for the development or strengthening of community-based programs. The Act also authorizes a National Communications System and provides for technical assistance and short-term training.

The Runaway Youth Program is administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) through its Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF), which is part of the Office of Human Development Services (OHDS). Within ACYF, the Youth Development Bureau (YDB) is responsible for managing the Runaway Youth grants program and related research and demonstration activities.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Program was committed to the following activities during Fiscal Year 1981:

- o The program awarded $10.2 million in grants to 169 runaway and homeless youth centers located throughout the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.
- o The program supported centers which provided temporary shelter and/or long-term counseling to 45,000 youth and drop-in services to approximately 133,000 young people.
- o The program operated the National Runaway Switchboard, a 24-hour toll-free hotline, which provided referral and crisis intervention assistance to approximately 200,000 youth and their families.

---

* The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415) was amended by the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977 (P.L. 95-115) and the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-509).

- The program enhanced the capacity of funded programs to serve runaway and homeless youth through a national technical assistance and training contract, the Youth Services Institute, site visits by regional staff, and conferences of grantees.

- The program documented that the Runaway Youth Centers have further diversified their sources of income which will result in decreased dependence on Federal funds and expansion of program services.

- The program sponsored grants to coordinated networks of centers and other agencies to increase effectiveness and participation of centers in State-level services planning.

- The program supported research and demonstration activities to test new service models and provide a secondary analysis of client data submitted by grantee agencies.

- The program collaborated with other Federal programs, State and local units of government, and the private sector to improve services to vulnerable youth and their families.

These activities have been an important source of assistance in meeting the needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families.

INTRODUCTION

Section 315 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 5715, requires that the Secretary of Health and Human Services report to the Congress annually on the status and accomplishments of the centers funded under the Act. This annual report on Fiscal Year 1981 activities of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program is submitted in response to this legislative requirement.

This annual report describes the centers funded and clients served under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act during Fiscal Year 1981. It also discusses additional activities undertaken by the Youth Development Bureau to carry out the statutory mandate. The FY 1981 Annual Report includes a discussion of the following:

- Status and Accomplishments: characteristics of the clients served and the programs funded, and a summary of achievements of the national Runaway Youth Program.

- Implementation of the Grants Program: summary of the types of grantees, the competitive funding process and related grants management activities.

- Supportive National Activities: efforts of the Youth Development Bureau to enhance and support the provision of quality services by the runaway and homeless youth centers.

- Research and Demonstration Activities: programs that are supported to increase the Federal knowledge base on the changing needs of vulnerable youth or evaluate the effectiveness of the new service models that are being developed to meet these needs.

- Federal Collaborative Activities: activities carried out by YDB to support and strengthen Federal interagency coordination related to the needs of youth.

Before discussing the foregoing, a brief summary of the legislative history and an overview of the program will provide valuable background information.

Legislative History and Program Background

In passing the Runaway Youth Act in 1974, (Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974; P.L. 93-415), the Congress acknowledged the effectiveness of community-based runaway youth centers that had been established in many parts of the country during the late 1960s. These programs provided safe shelter and emergency assistance to runaway youth. The Federal funding authorized by the Act provided support to these existing runaway youth centers and funded many new programs in unserved communities.

The Congress extended the Runaway Youth Act for three additional years in the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977 (P.L. 95-115). The amendments expanded the scope of the program to include "otherwise homeless youth." The Congress mandated Federal support for networks that improve the coordination of services to runaway and homeless youth. The amendments also increased the maximum level of Federal support that could be awarded to the centers.

In 1980, the 96th Congress reauthorized the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act as Title III of the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-509). The amended Act also instituted a funding allocation based on each State's youth population as a proportion of the total national youth population.

Section 315 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes the national Runaway Youth Program to address the following purposes:

1) To alleviate the immediate problems of runaway and homeless youth;

2) To reunite children with their families and encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

3) To strengthen family relationships and encourage stable living conditions for children; and

4) To help youth decide upon a future course of action.

To implement these purposes as defined by Congress, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) placed the administration of the Runaway Youth Program with the Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF), which is part of the Office of Human Development Services (OHDS). Within ACYF, the Youth Development Bureau (YDB) manages the runaway youth grants program which funds runaway youth centers. The Youth Development Bureau also conducts an integrated program of research, demonstration and evaluation to meet a broad range of youth needs, problems and developmental issues. The Bureau publishes and disseminates the findings of its research, demonstration and evaluation efforts and also provides the public and other governmental agencies with information on youth needs/problems and on new program approaches developed by runaway and homeless youth centers across the country.

The national Runaway Youth Program funds innovative community-based youth and family centers and networks designed to improve the coordination of services. Some of the features and contributions of the programs funded are highlighted below:

- The centers and networks respond rapidly to the immediate needs of runaway and homeless youth for shelter and safety, while concurrently involving the family and youth in longer-term planning and counseling.

- The centers and networks directly provide a comprehensive set of services including: outreach; 24-hour intake; assessment and planning; temporary shelter; individual, group and family counseling; and aftercare. In addition, they provide directly or through referrals to other agencies alternative living arrangements, medical services, psychological or psychiatric assistance, and legal assistance in the community.

- The centers and networks significantly reduce the involvement of youth with juvenile justice and public welfare agencies and obtain resources for youth and their families, where necessary, through established linkages with these systems.
- The centers and networks are used as alternatives to institutionalization or detention by juvenile courts, public welfare and law enforcement agencies in many communities.
- The centers and networks are catalysts in promoting increased community responsiveness to the needs of vulnerable youth and families.

In 1981, $10.2 million in grants was awarded to support program services in 169 centers. Approximately 133,000 youth were served on a one-time, drop-in basis and 45,000 youth were sheltered and/or received long-term counseling. This represents a 25 percent increase in the number of young people served since YDB began data collection efforts in 1978.

I. STATUS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This chapter summarizes the current status and recent accomplishments of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program. In summary, the number of programs supported under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act has increased from 158 in FY 1980 to 169 in FY 1981. This increase has been accomplished without additional funding. To meet the continuing need for services to runaway and homeless youth, the programs funded by YDB are broadening the range of services they offer. To meet rising costs, these programs are also diversifying their funding sources. During Fiscal Year 1981, YDB supported technical assistance and training activities to increase grantee responsiveness to the needs of youth and families. The preceding statements are discussed in greater detail in the following paragraphs.

Services Utilized by Runaway and Homeless Youth and their Families

In 1976, the runaway youth centers served 15,000 youth, the National Toll-Free Runaway Switchboard served 19,000. By FY 1978, the centers had more than doubled the numbers served (32,000), and the Switchboard had assisted 135,000 youth. In FY 1979, 40,013 youth were sheltered and/or received long-term counseling; 118,949 were served as one-time, drop-in clients; and 143,000 called the Switchboard. During FY 1980, 133,000 drop-ins were served, 44,000 were sheltered and/or received ongoing counseling, and nearly 200,000 used the Switchboard. In FY 1981, services were provided to 133,000 drop-in clients, 45,000 sheltered clients and 200,000 persons who called the Switchboard.

Characteristics of the Clients Served

A secondary analysis of data compiled on the clients served by the projects funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act revealed the following information. Of youth seeking assistance, 20 percent of the youth did so for a non-runaway related reason (e.g., school problems, drug/alcohol abuse, etc.), 17 percent were away from home by mutual agreement, and 13 percent had been pushed out by a parent or legal guardian. The data also indicated that the most frequently reported problems of the youth served by the runaway youth centers were: (1) poor communication with parents; (2) existence or fear of child abuse and neglect; (3) parents placing unreasonable demands or restrictions on the youth; (4) disruption within the family system independent of conflict with the youth; and (5) school-related problems. However, only one problem--"poor communication with parents"--is found in over 50 percent of the cases.

The analysis also revealed that 56 percent of the eligible parents received some type of services from runaway and homeless youth programs. In addition, the centers provided services to a significant number of non-housed youth, 21 percent of the total client population served.

The Centers Expanded Service Coordination and Networking Efforts

All of the centers funded under the Act participated in local, State or multi-State human services networks designed to provide joint planning, training, service delivery, assessment and information sharing activities. In an effort to increase the scope and quality of services available to vulnerable youth, networks membership also included mental health, juvenile justice, and social service agencies .

The Centers Diversified Their Funding Base and Community Support

Each of the centers funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act during FY 1981 also received funds from sources other than YDB. These funding resources included combinations of Federal, State, county, and city funding, as well as contributions from the private and voluntary sectors. An analysis of additional funding sources is listed in Figure 1-1 in the appendices. Several key points from the analysis are summarized below:

- YDB grants to centers ranged from $8,500 to $150,000, with an average funding level of $51,694. YDB grants comprised an average of 31 percent of the total program budget for runaway and homeless youth centers.

- The amount of the total program budget of the centers ranged from $22,730 to $588,841, and averaged $165,652.

- Other Federal sources of funding reported by the grantees included the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (24 percent of the centers); programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture (31 percent of the centers); and Title XX of the Social Security Act (22 percent of the centers).

- Seventy-two percent of the centers reported receiving financial assistance from State governments. Thirty-four percent of this assistance was received from Departments of Public Welfare or Social Services; 15 percent from Departments of Children and Youth; 12 percent from mental health agencies; and 12 percent from Criminal Justice agencies or Departments of Juvenile Justice.

- Twenty-seven percent of the centers reported city and county sources of funding.

- Twelve percent of the centers reported receiving funds from private businesses or organizations.

- Thirty-eight percent of the centers reported receiving funds and in-kind services from volunteers, membership drives, and donations.

- Foundations contributed funds to 18 percent of the centers.

- Perhaps the most significant non-Federal source of support for these programs was the United Way. Forty percent of the centers received United Way funds, each center averaging $21,741. These contributions, in addition to other non-profit, private, and voluntary sources, constituted a large proportion of the operational budgets for runaway and homeless youth centers during 1981.

Networking Initiative Accomplishments

Each network funded by YDB successfully developed an innovative approach to improving service delivery for youth in their target area. The approaches frequently differed in purpose, and were tailored to the needs of the centers and the population served. Examples of these differing activities are listed below.

- Standards for youth services were developed.
- Financial contributions of the private and voluntary sectors were increased.
- Model legislation was enacted on the emancipation of minors and homeless or underserved young adults (ages 16-19).
- A funding assessment and planning process was developed enabling the centers in several States to reduce their dependence on Federal funds.
- Training and coordination with child welfare representatives throughout the country was undertaken in preparation for implementation of the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-272).
- A peer review model was implemented in one Federal region. The model was based upon specialized standards for runaway and homeless youth programs and a system for review and corrective technical assistance.

Additional YDB Efforts to Support the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program

During FY 1981, YDB worked to expand services and disseminate knowledge to programs and center staff through the following efforts:

- The national Youth Services Institute was established in 1979 to provide advanced training to runaway youth center staff. In 1981, the Institute was convened in Oberlin, Ohio. Forty center staff and several Federal representatives participated in the training which related to fund-raising, State policy development and board development.
- Research and demonstration efforts focused on family transition prompted by separation and divorce, adolescent abuse and neglect, and adolescent day care.
- The national Technical Assistance and Training program continued to provide on-site assistance to center staff in program management and development. In addition, new FY 1981 grantees received training on operational standards and other program management concerns.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRANTS PROGRAM

Overview

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act provides that priority for funding be given to organizations with demonstrated experience in serving runaway and homeless youth seeking grants of less than $150,000. Further, the statute requires that centers funded under the Act provide services outside the formal juvenile justice and law enforcement systems, that they be located in areas frequented or easily reached by runaway and homeless youth and their families, and that they not have single-site maximum capacity of more than 20 youth. States, localities, private non-profit agencies and networks of such agencies are eligible to apply for grants. While in the past funds had been awarded through competition within each of the ten Federal Regions, an amendment to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act in 1980 added the requirement that funds be allocated according to the youth population in each State.

A total of $10.2 million was available for grants in FY 1981. One-hundred sixty nine (169) grants were awarded. Forty-two programs not previously funded received four-year grants and 127 agencies which had previously been funded received two-year grants. During the grant award period, these grants are subject to non-competitive renewal, based upon review and approval of grantee activities by YDB regional and central office staff. (A list of the FY 1981 grantees is included in the Appendices to this annual report.)

The funding process for the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act is a coordinated effort shared by the YDB staff in Washington, D.C., and the ten Special Assistants for Youth Affairs (SAYAs) based in the regional offices of OHDS/ACYF. The SAYAs identify new applicants, disseminate application kits, convene outside review panels, recommend grantees (including grant amounts), and conduct post-award program and grant administration. The central office develops and distributes funding guidance and State funding allocations to the regional offices. Special efforts were made by the SAYAs to encourage a wide range of new applications for the FY 1981 competitive funding cycle, particularly in those States that had previously limited participation in the program. During FY 1981, 1,200 application kits were distributed nationwide and 169 grants were awarded.

Types of Centers Funded

Grantees funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act are all required to provide services which address the four purposes defined in the Act. The first grants were made in 1975 to 65 programs. These original 65 programs largely utilized the basic runaway youth center program model developed by grass-roots efforts in the late sixties. With Federal leadership and changing client needs, a more diverse mix of grantee program styles has now emerged. Fiscal Year 1981 grantees included States, localities, private voluntary agencies and multi-agency networks which coordinate services. An analysis of the types of programs reveals three basic models:

- Community Network Model: The community network is made up of coordinated agreements and arrangements between several community organizations. These organizations may include a community-based counseling center, a shelter house, the police department, the juvenile court, the child welfare department and the school system. These agencies have a common policy and procedure for handling runaway crisis situations.

- Community Development Program Model: The community development program operates as a multi-service center, providing services to a specific geographic community. Examples of community projects include: developing foster parent groups and senior citizen clubs, operating a recycling center, supervising an adolescent drop-in center, and managing an emergency hotline service. At the same time, each agency provides all the core runaway and homeless youth program services outlined in the Act.

- Runaway and Homeless Youth Center Model: The runaway and homeless youth center is a small facility which focuses entirely on providing shelter and services to runaway and homeless youth and their families. The model is designed to respond rapidly to family crisis situations. The center operates out of a house or an office with a network of voluntary foster homes. Most centers house from six to fourteen youths. The duration of a placement ranges from one day to approximately two weeks. The center serves from 40 to 180 runaway and homeless youth per month. The core services provided are food, shelter, and individual counseling. Family agencies ensure the availability of long-term and specialized assistance.

Administration and Monitoring

During FY 1981, the Youth Development Bureau managed the national Runaway Youth Program, developed program policy guidance, and assured coordination among the regions regarding the administration of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. The Bureau also developed a Management Information System (MIS) which gathers information from funded centers and provides demographic statistics on the clients served.

YDB also worked to ensure that Runaway and Homeless Youth Centers were able to utilize the full range of resources available at the local, State, regional and Federal levels. To identify gaps that might require coordination at the Federal level, YDB asked the YDB-funded centers to identify the local linkages established with other service providers in the community and their additional sources of funding. YDB provided the centers with information about other Federal agency resources, and encouraged their participation in local, State, regional and Federal social services planning efforts. Representatives of many of the YDB-funded centers serve on neighborhood, city, and county planning groups and participate in State, regional and national youth service advisory boards.

Each of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Centers was visited by YDB staff during Fiscal Year 1981. The purpose of these visits was to review management plans, linkages with other agencies and systems, and applicable local, State and Federal laws. These site visits in combination with a review of grantee annual reports, allowed YDB staff to identify technical assistance and training needs of the programs funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

III. SUPPORTIVE NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

To enhance the services provided by runaway youth centers in local communities, the Youth Development Bureau has undertaken additional initiatives to link local programs and improve their effectiveness. During FY 1981 these initiatives included supporting the National Communications System, sponsoring the National Youth Services Institute, awarding grants to coordinated networks of services, and offering technical assistance and training to grantee agencies and their staffs.

The National Communications System

Section 311 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, 42 U.S.C. 5711, authorizes the creation of the National Communications System. The system that has been established has two components: the National Runaway Switchboard and the Agency Information System.

The National Runaway Switchboard (NRS) assisted 200,000 youth and families during FY 1981. It is a national, confidential, toll-free information, referral and crisis intervention telephone service. The Department of Health and Human Services began providing funds to support the Switchboard which is operated by Metro-Help, Inc., of Chicago, Illinois in August 1974. Since FY 1975, it has been supported under the Runaway Youth Act and administered by YDB. In January 1979, funding for the Illinois portion of the National Runaway Switchboard was assumed by the State of Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention, using funds authorized by Title XX of the Social Security Act. The hotline responds to the interstate nature of the runaway youth problem and the lack of specialized resources/services for runaway and homeless youth in many areas of the nation. The number of calls received by NRS has increased each fiscal year as summarized below:

Fiscal Year	# of Calls
1975	22,000
1976	40,000
1977	65,000
1978	105,000
1979	125,000
1980	145,000
1981	200,000

The NRS is designed to help young people who have run away from, been thrown out of, or are considering leaving home, and their families. The Switchboard links its callers with the help they need in three ways:

- o Prevention: identifying home-community resources to assist young people and their families who call the Switchboard before a runaway incident;
- o Intervention: providing a neutral channel of commnication through which runaway and homeless youth can reestablish contact with their parents/guardians and receive counseling; and
- o Referral: identifying agency resources for youth and their families in the communities from which they are calling.

The Switchboard operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year with a paid staff of nine full-time employees, five to 15 part-time employees and more than 100 trained volunteers. Through the Switchboard, youth receive information, referral, and counseling services at the time of their first call, regardless of their location. Youth and families may access the services by dialing toll-free 800/621-4000 from 48 States (except Alaska and Hawaii). The Switchboard maintains information on several thousand agencies offering services to young people and their families. The National Runaway Switchboard helps runaway youth reestablish contact with their homes by either conferencing a call between the youth and their parents or by conveying messages back and forth.

In FY 1977, the National Communications System established a second component, the Agency Information System (AIS). AIS assists youth service agencies in delivering more effective services by facilitating interagency communication on specific client cases. Accessible only to the agencies, the AIS can be utilized through an unpublished, toll-free telephone number obtainable from Metro-Help, Inc. The AIS operates ten hours a day, five days a week. The AIS has succeeded in removing agency calls from the National Runaway Switchboard so that its lines can serve more young people and their families.

National Youth Services Institute

Requests from grantees for specialized education courses led YDB to create the Youth Services Institute (YSI) in 1979. The Institute is an integral part of the technical assistance and short-term training authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Continuing education opportunities are critical to job performance and in minimizing staff turnover in youth service agencies. YSI training is provided to center staff to assist them in improving the quality of their own programs and to help them in training other service providers in their regions, States and localities. In FY 1981, 40 center staff participated in the Youth Services Institute held in Oberlin, Ohio. Regional and headquarters YDB staff also participated in the YSI, thus improving their ability to provide technical assistance to grantees.

Topics for YSI courses are selected annually on the basis of grantee input and program needs identified by regional YDB staff. Courses are developed by recognized experts in each area of study and a manual is prepared for each course and distributed to all grantees. Courses for 1981 included such topics as:

- o Social Policy: In response to shifting responsibility for social policy, this course focused on the State and local policy development processes. (Designed and taught by Milan Dluhy, Ph.D., Professor, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
- o Boards of Directors: This course addressed the use of Boards which constitute one of the most under-utilized and ill-managed resources available to public and private non-profit organizations. (Designed and taught by John Tropman, Ph.D., Professor, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)

- **Resource Development:** Reflecting anticipated changes in funding patterns, this course focused on non-Federal funding sources, such as corporations, foundations, direct contributions, endowments. (Designed and taught by Beverly Farrand of the Center for Community Change in Washington, D. C.)

Coordinated Network Initiative

The coordinated networking initiative began in 1978. The Youth Development Bureau tested the feasibility of using networks for the transfer of technology through special technical assistance and training activities conducted in Federal Region VI. The emerging grantee network, the Southwest Network of Youth Services, conducted a multi-State conference involving a broad spectrum of State, Federal and private agencies to exchange information regarding the service needs of runaway youth and their families. The Network also improved staff training by developing a staff exchange program that allowed resource people from runaway youth centers to train other staff within runaway youth centers.

Following this initial demonstration of the networking model, in 1980 the Congress authorized in Section 311 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act the awarding of grants to coordinated networks of runaway youth service providers. In response, the Youth Development Bureau established the Coordinated Network Initiative. The purpose of this initiative is to establish models and systems which improve the coordination of Federal and State government responsibilities for the runaway youth centers. Specifically, the networking initiative addresses the need to:

- provide services which are cost-effective, and locally controlled and administered;
- reduce dependency on Federal financial assistance while maintaining the quality and breadth of the services provided;
- assure the diversity of assistance in terms of funding and services provided;
- foster the ongoing evaluation of centers' practices, procedures, and services based upon standards defined by individual State and local governments, and reflective of measurable client outcomes; and
- improve staff competence and increase the transfer of sound administrative and direct service practices in a cost-effective manner.

During FY 1980, all ten regional offices participated in the Coordinated Network Initiative. In FY 1981, the second year of this initiative, eight grants were awarded to State and intra-State networks and a related grant to the National Conference of State Legislatures. In both 1980 and 1981, supplemental grants ranging from $10,000 to $25,000 were awarded to runaway youth centers for networking purposes. The goals of these grants were to:

- establish or strengthen multi-disciplinary linkages of centers with other youth and family service providers to improve service delivery to runaway, homeless and other vulnerable youth and their families;
- increase the competence and administrative skills of professionals who work in runaway and homeless youth centers; and
- encourage center participation in joint planning, training, intake, treatment, evaluation, and information exchange efforts with mental health, law enforcement, and other social service agencies.

Although each of the regional or State networks utilized the grant for differing purposes, all of the coordinated networking grantees shared the following common activities:

- collecting program, staff development and youth policy information to be widely disseminated in newsletters;
- promoting staff exchanges among programs to transfer problem-solving strategies;
- utilizing the expertise of program staff to provide training at workshops rather than using outside consultants;
- developing handbooks or training manuals for youth services workers;
- implementing agreements with State and local juvenile justice and social services agencies; and
- acquiring non-Federal sources of financial support to foster State and local program control.

In Fiscal Year 1981, the eight networking grants were focused on the following activities:

- coordination of network activities at the local level to establish or strengthen formal working relationships with other youth and family service providers to improve service delivery to runaway, homeless, and other vulnerable youth and their families;
- participation by networks in activities that assist State and local, private and public non-profit agencies (and coalitions of such agencies) in planning and designing social services for vulnerable youth; and
- assessment of redesigning service delivery systems, including such factors as cost, quality of services, organizational and budget constraints, resource planning and allocation procedures. The eight FY 1981 networking grantees, by region, are:

Region I :	New England Networking Project Grantee: The Bridge, West Hartford, CN
Region II :	The Empire State Coalition Grantee: Compass House, Buffalo, NY
Region III :	Youth Services Alliance of Pennsylvania Grantee: Valley Youth House Bethlehem, PA
Region IV :	Southeastern Network of Youth and Family Services Grantee: The Bridge Family Center Atlanta, GA
Region VI :	Southwest Network of Runaway and Youth Services Grantee: Youth Shelter of Galveston Galveston, TX
Region VII :	Missouri Prevention Network Grantee: The Front Door, Columbus, MO Youth in Need, St. Charles, MO
Region VIII:	Mountain Plains Youth Services Coalition Grantee: Same as above
Region IX :	Region IX of the National Network Grantee: Diogenes Youth Services Sacramento, CA

Networking Initiative: State Legislatures

A second component of the networking initiative was created to increase State participation in providing services to youth. This was particularly significant since many of the programs which serve vulnerable youth have operated outside State social service systems. In 1981, a grant was awarded to the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) to link the networking grantees directly to State legislators and to provide technical assistance to State policy-makers regarding the needs of vulnerable youth. The purposes of the NCSL grant were to:

- share interdisciplinary information on services to vulnerable youth with State legislatures, State and local governmental agencies, and private and voluntary organizations;
- create linkages between Federally funded programs serving vulnerable youth and appropriate State legislative and planning officials; and
- establish a method for systematically gathering and disseminating information to State and local planning bodies on cost-effective models for delivering services which are easily replicated.

In order to accomplish these purposes, the National Conference of State Legislatures focused its efforts on:

- providing general resource information regarding youth services to State legislatures;
- developing a guide to youth services for State legislators; and
- disseminating a quarterly newsletter to 7,500 State legislators and their staffs on a variety of youth issues.

National Technical Assistance and Training

Section 311 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes the provision of technical assistance and short-term training to centers funded under the Act. The national contractor, Aurora Associates of Washington, D. C., provides and coordinates technical assistance and training activities to increase the capacity of these centers to meet the needs of runaway or otherwise homeless youth and their families. Since the passage of the Runaway Youth Act in 1974, the contractor has provided technical assistance to centers in such areas as organizational development, community organization and direct service delivery. All runaway youth centers as well as the National Communications System have received services from this effort.

The four major goals of the national technical assistance effort are:

- Administration of Runaway and Homeless Youth Centers: to enhance the administrative and fiscal capabilities of the centers to plan, implement and evaluate their service programs;
- Coordination with Federal and State Policy: to help centers respond to existing or new Federal and State legislation, policy and programs that affect services to runaway or homeless youth and their families;
- Staff Training: to provide runaway center staff with current information and skills for more effective service delivery; and
- Long-Term Program Evaluation and Planning: to assist centers in future planning and development by critically analyzing programs for strengthening management and service delivery components.

The provision of technical assistance and training services has been instrumental in improving the operational and program capacities of the runaway and homeless youth centers. Newly funded centers view these services as particularly critical to ensuring the successful "startup" of program services.

IV. RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION ACTIVITIES

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act also supports research and demonstration projects to increase the knowledge available concerning runaway and homeless youth and their families and to strengthen planning and programming designed to meet their needs. During FY 1981, several demonstration projects were funded to test new models of service delivery. In addition, research was funded to extract additional information from the client data submitted by grantees. Several of these research and demonstration programs are highlighted below.

Services to Maltreated Youth and Families in Marital Transition

The goal of this program is to demonstrate how funded agencies can expand their services to meet more effectively the needs of youth and families experiencing crises. These crises may be associated with adolescent abuse and neglect, or parental separation, divorce and remarriage. The eight projects supported under this demonstration program have completed the first year of the two-year project period. Service approaches being used by these projects include:

- the development of extensive linkages with other community service providers, particularly local child protective service agencies, juvenile probation agencies, juvenile courts and mental health agencies;
- the training of medical and social services personnel to work with maltreated youth and their families;
- crisis intervention;
- individual and family counseling or psychotherapy;
- foster placement for youth unable to return home;
- single parent and multi-family counseling; and
- extensive public education activities.

In FY 1981, approximately 1,500 youth and family members participated in the four projects focusing on services to maltreated youth. In addition, approximately 1,800 youth and family members received services in the four projects designed for families in marital transition.

Youth Employment Demonstration Grants

The Youth Employment Demonstration Grants program is funded under a 24-month interagency agreement between HHS and the U. S. Departments of Labor and Justice. The program is designed to test innovative approaches for improving employment, training, and career development services for young people, particularly minority youth. The program operates within 17 centers funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

The objectives of this program are to:

- provide direct employment and educational services for homeless youth and other youth-at-risk;
- promote and improve the quality of youth work experience in the field of human services;
- involve youth in the design of service delivery systems and in the decision-making process;
- provide supportive services for highly vulnerable youth and heretofore unserved subgroups within the youth population;
- promote program linkages between education and work-related activities;

- expand service capacity in local communities by increasing resources;
- improve service delivery in local communities by establishing neighborhood-based groups and networks; and
- promote a coordinated national demonstration program to assess the quality and impact of youth work experiences supported by selected runaway youth programs.

Two program models were tested under this initiative. The Youth Participation Program Model is focused on involving youth in responsible, challenging work within the runaway youth centers and providing opportunities for decision-making, career exploration, and educational growth. This program component served youth aged 14 to 18 residing within the community in which the centers are located. The youth participating were identified as low achievers, potential dropouts, pushouts, or status offenders with little constructive involvement in community activities.

The second model, the Community Services Job Development Model, was designed to develop local community service jobs for youth. Efforts focused on preparing youth for placement in unsubsidized public or private sector jobs or appropriate educational or training programs. This was accomplished by providing short-term, intermediate, and full-term employment and training in a wide range of community service activities. This program component was targeted to reach homeless and severely disadvantaged youth aged 16 to the age of majority* who had histories of low academic achievement, unemployment, poor job search and retention skills, dependent children, and a variety of familial or social adjustment problems.

During a six-month data collection period, 315 youth were served by all 17 youth employment demonstration grants. These youth participants ranged in age from 14 to 21 years, with 71 percent under the age of 18. Two-thirds of the participants were female. One-half of the participants were minority youth. One in seven had graduated from high school or had obtained a GED; one in four had dropped out of school or had been suspended. The remainder were still in school. One-half of the youth participating were employed directly by a center funded by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act or its parent agency; one-fourth were placed in private sector jobs; one-sixth held public sector jobs; and a few were employed in youth-run businesses. Stipends for the participants averaged $3.19 an hour. All 17 of the youth employment projects provided job training and 13 of the projects provided employment readiness and skill training. The projects used CETA funds and/or positions to the fullest extent possible.

The participants in these two model demonstration projects reported a variety of positive effects of their participation: acquiring training, learning to live independently, earning money, and increasing their sense of personal competence, self-assurance, and self-worth. Improved relationships with others, especially peers, were also frequently cited as positive outcomes of the projects.

Project to Facilitate Access to the State-level Title XX System

A third demonstration project, supported by YDB and the Office of Policy Development in OHDS, is designed to assist the Ohio State Welfare Agency in working with the Ohio Youth Service Network. The common goal was to increase the availability of local services provided by Title XX of the Social Security Act to runaway and homeless youth and their families. This project has resulted in:

- the establishment of a special Title XX Coordinator position in the State Welfare Office to serve as liaison to the Ohio Youth Service Network and participate in local county planning groups;

---

* The age of majority varies from State to State.

- the provision of cross-training of State welfare and runaway center staff; and
- the implementation of model outreach and aftercare service components within the nine participating runaway youth centers.

The project has developed models for the provision of outreach and aftercare services which can be replicated by other runaway and homeless youth centers. In addition, progress has been made in establishing a model reporting methodology that will both meet the requirements of social services agencies and ensure the confidentiality provisions of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. The project has made a significant contribution to the development of the Title XX State Comprehensive Plan. The project also has prepared a manual to assist youth service agencies interested in obtaining Title XX funds and services.

Secondary Analysis of Client Data

In the area of research, YDB contracted for a secondary analysis of the data that have been compiled on the young people receiving services from Runaway and Homeless Youth projects funded since 1977. The purposes of this contract are: to conduct comprehensive analyses and realiability checks on the data; to develop a detailed profile of the clients being served and their service requirements, including changes in both over time; and to assess the effectiveness of the services provided.

The analyses that are being conducted are designed to provide information in the following areas:

- the basic demographic characteristics of the runaway youth population, including changes, if any, over time;
- the range of problems of youth at the time they seek project assistance;
- the types of services that are provided directly by the projects, and indirectly through referrals to other community agencies;
- the extent and impact of parental involvement in project services;
- the extent to which various client differentials (such as demographic variables, presenting problems, referral source, client type, family involvement in services) influence the services provided clients, client outcomes, and program effectiveness; and
- the extent to which the projects address client needs and reunite youth with their families.

Results of these analyses are being compiled.

V. FEDERAL COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITIES

As part of the administration of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Youth Development Bureau establishes linkages with other Federal programs serving runaway and homeless youth grantees. YDB staff participated in a number of collaborative activities with other Federal agencies during FY 1981.

Federal Coordinating Council for Delinquency Prevention

One vehicle for such collaboration is the Federal Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention which was established in 1974. The Council coordinates Federal delinquency prevention and control efforts and makes recommendations to the Congress and the President on overall Federal delinquency policy. A recent Council study identified 45 separate Federal programs in seven cabinet level departments and two independent agencies that provide assistance to State and locally operated youth programs. The Director of the Youth Development Bureau, the Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services serve on the Council.

The priorities established by the Council in Fiscal Year 1981 were: (1) deinstitutionalization of status offenders; (2) separation of juveniles and adults in correction facilities, and (3) provision of services for mentally retarded and disturbed offenders. The Council also facilitated information exchange and joint funding agreements between member agencies.

Baltimore Blueprint

The Baltimore Blueprint is a joint public and private planning effort charged with increasing cooperation and effectiveness of human services in Baltimore. YDB staff have worked with local officials to analyze juvenile justice policy and negotiate simplification of procedures and other reforms. YDB staff have provided the Blueprint organization with assistance in the areas of pre-arraignment programs, foster care recruitment and selection standards, and Federal resource availability.

Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration

YDB established coordinative efforts with the Department's Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) beginning in 1978. A recent survey of programs funded by the Youth Development Bureau explored the extent of substance abuse by runaway and homeless youth. Results of the survey revealed that:

- eighty-two percent of center staff considered drug and alcohol abuse to be a problem for youth and families served;
- seventy-one percent identified alcohol abuse and 42 percent identified drug abuse as a significant problem;
- sixty-two percent felt that the types of services available to meet drug and alcohol related service needs were inadequate; and
- seventy-one percent considered alcohol abuse and 42 percent considered drug abuse to be a problem for parents.

In FY 1981, YDB worked with ADAMHA to develop an interagency agreement to support demonstration programs and related activities addressing substance abuse among the youth and families served by runaway and homeless youth centers. In addition, YDB has encouraged grantees to link with State substance abuse agencies and other pertinent State programs.

Additional YDB activities with ADAMHA included coordination with the National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH) contract to study "Runaway Programs at Mental Health Centers." YDB staff also served on a NIMH group working on the effects of the implementation of the Mental Health Systems Act on runaway and homeless youth and their families.

CONCLUSION

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, as amended, now supports 169 runaway and homeless youth centers in all 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Each of these centers participates in networks of public and private services within individual communities, States and regions to enhance its ability to offer alternatives to involvement with juvenile justice, law enforcement and public welfare agencies for vulnerable youth and their families. The role of the Youth Development Bureau has been to increase services and program effectiveness without increasing Federal expenditures. YDB has also worked to increase knowledge about runaway and homeless youth and their families and promote testing and dissemination of new service models for this population. The Youth Development Bureau has also assisted grantees in diversifying their sources of income and the services they provide by emphasizing the building of community service networks and the use of local and volunteer resources. All of these activities have contributed to the effective implementation of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act in Fiscal Year 1981.

Senator **Specter**. Now I would like to call on a panel consisting of Gerald Robertson, Kelly Weisberg, and Dotson Rader.

Welcome, lady and gentlemen. We appreciate your coming here today.

Let us begin with Detective Robertson, if we may.

Your points of identification delineate beyond the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department. There is a notation that you are in the Prostitution Enforcement Unit.

We welcome you here. We appreciate your taking the time to come and we ask for your testimony on the subject.

STATEMENTS OF PANEL CONSISTING OF: GERALD ROBERTSON, DETECTIVE, D.C. METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, THIRD DISTRICT, PROSTITUTION ENFORCEMENT UNIT; D. KELLY WEISBERG, SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE, URBAN AND RURAL SYSTEMS ASSOCIATES, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.; ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, HASTINGS COLLEGE OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO; AND DOTSON RADER, WRITER, PARADE MAGAZINE, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. **Robertson**. Good morning. First of all, I would like to thank the committee for asking me to come here this morning and speak on the problem that I think is of great importance.

I would also like to make known on the record that anything I say on the record may not be the policy of the Metropolitan Police Department and, in fact, would be my own opinions and judgments based on my own experience.

I am here this morning to talk about sexual exploitation of children; in essence, children involved in prostitution. If you want to know how bad the problem is in Washington, D.C., since 1977 we have averaged over 100 kids a year that we have picked up or are being charged with soliciting, prostitutes or runaways involved in some sort of prostitution.

Senator **Specter**. How many is that, Detective Robertson?

Mr. **Robertson**. On average over 100 a year since 1977.

Senator **Specter**. One hundred a year?

Mr. **Robertson**. Yes.

Senator **Specter**. Who are minors, under, say, the age of 18?

Mr. **Robertson**. Under the age of 18, yes, sir. If we are talking about 100 larcenies or burglaries in this city which has a population of 700,000, we would say the problem is not too serious. But prostitution affects the life and not the pocketbook.

We found that in this town we have a serious problem of child prostitution, pornography, both male and female. We can safely assume, based on the 100 for this city, that there is 100 in every major city in each of the 50 States. That is 50,000 kids involved in child prostitution.

Recently a report was presented by the U.S. General Accounting Office. It contains 56 pages of a study done nationwide of 22 cities of child prostitution. That is exactly what it is, a report. Although their intentions are well made, it does not attack the problem. It simply say, what we can do and what we cannot. It does not go into what goes on on the street and what goes on with prostitution. That is why I am here today.

Senator SPECTER. Detective Robertson, what is the customary position for a minor arrested on a charge of prostitution?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is the policy of the police department in Washington, D.C., if we can avoid giving a child a criminal charge, that is, if she is charged with prostitution and she is from out-of-State jurisdiction, we will drop the charges of prostitution. She will be handled as a runaway and sent home under the Interstate Compact Act.

Senator SPECTER. Those under 18 are treated in the juvenile court system.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir.

Senator SPECTER. So there is an ultimate determination of delinquency as opposed to technically a criminal charge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir. We would rather have that child listed as a juvenile or absconded rather than put into the criminal justice system.

Senator SPECTER. On these cases of child prostitution, are they all female?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Male and female.

Senator SPECTER. What would the proportion be?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The proportion is greater females. When we talk about male prostitution, we are talking about a very covert activity. Male prostitution tends to be more underground, more inside, as opposed to the females who are out on the streets walking the street every night.

Senator SPECTER. What is the youngest you have seen of a female child prostitute?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Eleven.

Senator SPECTER. And the youngest of a male?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thirteen.

Senator SPECTER. What is your recommendation as to what ought to be done to deal with this problem?

Mr. ROBERTSON. First of all, I think there ought to be a uniform program nationwide, on a national and State level, to deal with these kids. Listening to the earlier speaker regarding the 1 million runaways we have each year, it is my contention that you have two different types of people. You have a runaway, on one side, who is looking for something, who needs help and assistance is being given. You have the prostitution runaway who has not been involved in prostitution for any length of time needs a different type of help, counseling. She knows she can go on the street and make $500 a night and does not have to worry about it. A young girl 14 or 15 years old which has been a prostitute for any period of time is very hardened, very streetwise. To send this young lady back to her home environment, which may have caused her to leave in the first place, you have not accomplished anything. You have to provide her something better. You have to evaluate and make her feel she is worth something besides being on the street. Life, as we call it, on the street deals with pimps and their own code of justice. We have to take this young prostitute out of that code and show her it is wrong. Each community does have to admit we do have a child prostitution problem. Going around the country and talking to the various departments, their own city police departments and city councils do not want to admit that the problem exists in their cities and, therefore, the allocations are not made manpowerwise to investigate it and look into the problem.

These are the two things I think should be done.

Senator SPECTER. What role, if any, do you see for the Federal Government?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the Federal Government as a backer or as a beginner, anyway, could help establish some type of uniform program where the States can report into the Government, an agency with the Government, the amount of kids being handled in their own jurisdictions. A kid from Iowa or Pennsylvania, if she is a prostitute and has been for some time, this city jurisdiction here will simply send that kid home as a runaway. The home State jurisdiction has no knowledge she was involved in prostitution. There is no one there to intervene once she comes home. She may stay there, home for a while, and then goes to Houston and is picked up for prostitution in Houston and sent back again. Again, there is no indication to tell Pennsylvania that this child is a prostitute and needs some sort of help. Federal backing to the point where they can establish a program where it is a national thing, a centralized location where the States report into and communitywise to work with these kids.

Senator SPECTER. Are there any records maintained on a Federal basis for such a problem?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not to my knowledge.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Detective Robertson.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Robertson follows.]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GERALD ROBERTSON

Sexual exploitation of children. Just how bad is the problem in Washington, D.C.? Since 1977 there has been an average of over 100 children a year taken into custody who were either charged with prostitution or picked up as runaways and found to be involved in some sort of prostitution activity.

If we were talking about over 100 larcenies a year in a city with a population of over 700,000, perhaps we could say that this was not too serious, but juvenile prostitution affects the life and not the pocketbook. The mental, emotional and more often than not, bodily injuries suffered by the prostitute, have the evenutal effect of deadining any elements of moral, social or cultural conscience she may have had. The young prostitute soon finds herself on a road going in a direction from which she may never return.

Statistics are useful tools and the use of numbers can represent information on a given subject. However, statistics in and of themselves do not establish right, wrong, seriousness, value, need for action or priorty. These factors can only be determined by human judgement based upon ones own moral principles.

It is beyond my comprehension how any person cannot readily see that these children are being used to the benefit of another. Many say that prostitution is a victemless crime, that it will never be abolished despite legislation and, at most, perhaps prostitution should be regulated. With juvenile prostitution we are not talking about a women 18 or older, emancipated and capable of making a mature judgement as to what she wants. Who could be so naive as to say that in juvenile prostitution there is no victim when it is obvious that the child herself is the victim. When one looks a juvenile prostitution in the proper context, which takes into account that it almost always ruins the life of the prostitute, it can only be seen as a problem of the most severe gravity. Certainly, the composite spirit of this country is too moralistic to condone tolerance of the sexual exploitation of children, therefore, the need for action is evident.

Recently the General Accounting Office published a report which contained the results of a study conducted in 22 major cities across the country in the area of Sexual Exploitation of Children. It contains 56 pages of statistics, social service reports and recommendations that have been proposed to combat the problems of teenage prostitution and child pornography. But, its just that, a report. It is one of many studies completed by hundreds of people over the past few years. This report, although done with good intentions, has done nothing to curtail the ever growing number of children who are drawn into prostitution, commonly called "THE LIFT". However, this is only a small problem. The big problem lies in the unwillingness of most major cities to admit that this type of problem even exists in their community and the inability of the various agencies and departments throughout the country to adopt a uniform method or program to effectively deal with these children who have fallen prey to exploitation by unscrupelous individuals, who by contrast, make Dicken's "FAGIN" look like an upstanding citizen.

We can talk about sexual exploitation of children until we are blue in the face. We can compile thousands of pages of written study, but until such time when we initiate criminal prosecutions against those who willfully violate the law and degrade and abuse these children, we as a society will continue to revolve in an everending circle. The pity of it is, that these children are just that, Children. When they become involved in prostitution there is a fine line drawn between morality and criminality with the final outcome that todays Child Prostitute may well be tomorrows hardened criminal.

Senator SPECTER. Now I would like to turn to D. Kelly Weisberg. Would you give us a little bit of your background as a preliminary?

STATEMENT OF D. KELLY WEISBERG

Dr. WEISBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear here this morning.

I am currently affiliated with the Urban and Rural Systems Associates. URSA is a social policy research firm in San Francisco. I am also an assistant professor at Hastings College of Law, University of California, San Francisco, specializing in the area of juvenile and family law.

I would like to say a few words to summarize briefly my prepared statement and then I would be very pleased to answer any questions you may have.

In October 1979 the social policy research firm with which I am affiliated was asked by the Youth Development Bureau of the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study of adolescent prostitution with a special focus on adolescent male prostitution. This was to be the first national study ever conducted of juvenile prostitution. It encompassed a study of adolescent prostitution in seven cities—Boston, New York, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Houston. It involved discussions with law enforcement, mental health workers, other social service delivery providers, psychologists, psychiatrists, as well as juveniles involved in prostitution.

There were several purposes of the study. The primary purpose was to provide a resource manual that would enable communities with this particular problem to deal with the problem more effectively.

Another purpose was to explore adolescent male prostitution—an often ignored facet of the problem of adolescent prostitution.

The third purpose was to compare male prostitution with adolescent female prostitution. For example, are they two sides of the same coin, or are they totally distinct phenomena?

And finally, we attempted to explore the relationship between runaway behavior, adolescent prostitution, child pornography and other forms of commercial sexual exploitation.

I will just briefly point to some of the findings of the study. They are discussed in much greater depth in the final reports of the study. Also they are summarized in the prepared statement attached to this testimony. But I will just mention a few of the major points. First of all, adolescent prostitution is widespread. It is also increasing. It is found in many small communities as well as most major metropolitan areas.

Senator SPECTER. When you say widespread, how do you define the scope?

Dr. WEISBERG. It is found in the large cities we studied as well as in smaller communities. It is pervasive. In the large cities, it is found primarily in certain zones within these communities, in what are known as sex trade zones, in the downtown regions of the cities.

Senator **Specter**. Is there any organization of it or is it simply a number of individuals operating on their own?

Dr. **Weisberg**. That involves a major difference between juvenile female prostitution and juvenile male prostitution. Female prostitution tends to be somewhat more organized. It tends to involve pimps. By and large, male prostitution tends not to involve pimps. Rather, these are young boys out there hustling on the streets. They are basically working for themselves.

Senator **Specter**. Is the organized crime element involved at all?

Dr. **Weisberg**. We have not found significant evidence that organized crime is involved, in terms of adolescent prostitution.

Senator **Specter**. Are arrests customarily made of the pimp in situations where juveniles are involved?

Dr. **Weisberg**. OK, that is one of the best approaches. Again, we are talking about female prostitutes, because we previously said that the males do not have pimps. In terms of female prostitution, efforts are made to arrest the pimps because the pimps are connected with much of the violence which is associated with prostitution.

Senator **Specter**. When you have pimps involved in female prostitution do you have a much wider variety of sanctions, criminal laws? If you have a pimp associated with an adult prostitute, the sanctions are much less.

Dr. **Weisberg**. That is quite true.

Senator **Specter**. If a juvenile is involved, you can charge them with corrupting the morals of a juvenile.

Dr. **Weisberg**. That is right. And, since the passage of the Protection of Children Against Sexual Exploitation Act, several States have enacted laws that impose sanctions for pimping juvenile prostitutes. The penalties are enhanced according to the age of the juvenile.

Senator **Specter**. Are you personally familiar with any prosecutions under that statute?

Dr. **Weisberg**. There have been prosecutions. I am not familiar with statistics on the numbers of prosecutions.

Senator **Specter**. Have there been tough sentences handed out?

Dr. **Weisberg**. Yes; indeed there have been.

Senator **Specter**. Do you know any of those sentences in terms of the length of incarceration?

Dr. **Weisberg**. Yes. Regarding State statutes, in Minnesota the penalty for promoting or inducing child prostitution is 10 years maximum or $10,000 fine or both. In other States such as New York, for example, the penalty may be enhanced significantly if the juvenile is, say, under age 11. Those are the most severe——

Senator **Specter**. If the juvenile is under the age of 11?

Dr. **Weisberg**. Yes. May I point out that we have found very few cases where the juveniles have been that young, although there have been reports to that effect in the media. We found occasional reports of 12- and 13-year-old prostitutes, but there appear to be very few of these youth.

Senator **Specter**. There are statutes which wait until under the age of 11 before enhancing the penalties?

Dr. **Weisberg**. No. I may have been misunderstood. The most severe penalties in New York are for pimping a juvenile who is under the age 11. Then there are other gradations according to the age of the juvenile. If the juvenile is less than 16, if the juvenile is less then 19. Then there are penalties for pimping an adult. New York has a 4 degree offense for promoting or inducing prostitution.

Senator **Specter**. I interrupted you. Proceed.

Dr. **Weisberg**. As I was saying, we found there are rather significant numbers of boys. These boys are often ignored by researchers. The boys are not as visible as girls. Certainly more law enforcement efforts are directed toward girls than boys. Boys tend to be part of the street culture. They tend to hang out on street corners, so it is not as obvious that they are engaged in prostitution.

We found, as well, that the growing numbers of adolescent male prostitutes are due in part to the emergence of the gay male subculture and the liberalization of attitudes regarding homosexuality. Many of the adolescent male prostitutes are in fact gay-identified.

Senator **Specter**. Did you say the emergence of the gay subculture or expansion?

Dr. **Weisberg**. I meant that the gay subculture is found more and more in large metropolitan areas that serve as meccas.

Senator **Specter**. Is the homosexual subculture expanding significantly, in your opinion?

Dr. **Weisberg**. I would say it is becoming more visible, Senator. In terms of actual statistics on expansion, I have no knowledge of that.

There are also a number of similarities and differences we found between juvenile female prostitutes and juvenile male prostitutes. Many of these similarities are somewhat surprising. We found there exists a very large proportion of juveniles who have been physically abused. This is true of both boys and girls. Similarly, a very large proportion have been sexually abused at home by family members. The youth tend to drop out of school at a very early age. Most fail to finish high school and a significant proportion drop out by grade 8. They are the hard-core unemployed. In the teenage years when they turn to prostitution they have few skills. Many are barely literate.

There are also differences, of course, between adolescent males and females. One of these, I mentioned before, the factor of pimps for the girls which is absent for the boys. The idea is that the boys are not organized. They freelance.

One of the most striking similarities has been that there is a large proportion of prostitutes who are runaways. Many of these youth run away from abusive family situations, from physical and sexual abuse. Many run from family conflicts. Often these concern conflicts about sexuality. For the girls issues concern conflicts about early heterosexual promiscuity. For the boys these conflicts may be about their homosexuality. The youth tend to run away in response to these situations. They tend to run to large cities. This is not to intimate that all prostitutes are runaways or that all runaways are prostitutes, merely that we found a strong connection between these two phenomena.

Senator **Specter**. What statistically, if you can say, is the correlation between being a runaway and being involved in prostitution?

Dr. **Weisberg**. We found that as many as three-quarters of the boys who were prostitutes were also runaways. The same figures are true for girls and it is suspected that there are even more girls who are runaways.

Senator SPECTER. Three-quarters of the prostitutes are runaways?

Dr. WEISBERG. Yes.

Senator SPECTER. What percentage of the runaways are prostitutes?

Dr. WEISBERG. That is a more difficult question. I have seen statistics, cited in the GAO report, on Sexual Exploitation of Children for New York which suggest that from 50 to 90 percent of all runaways are prostitutes. I think those figures are somewhat high. Covenant House, a runaway shelter in New York, has collected other statistics from the adolescent population they serve, by asking their clients if their problems are sex-related. They found that about 11 percent of the runaways were involved potentially in prostitution. I would say that the figures are somewhere between 11 and 20 percent, in that ballpark.

Senator SPECTER. Between 11 and 20 percent of runaways get involved in prostitution?

Dr. WEISBERG. Maybe that many, yes.

Senator SPECTER. What about sexual exploitation beyond the specifics of prostitution?

Dr. WEISBERG. If you are talking about the question of juvenile involvement in pornography, we found very little evidence of that. In prior Senate hearings on the Protection of Children Against Sexual Exploitation there were discussions of the large numbers of juveniles who were involved in pornography and of the interrelationship between child pornography and prostitution. We found, however, that those two phenomena are not intimately related.

Of the juvenile prostitutes with whom we spoke, less then a quarter had been photographed by customers and by and large those photographs were for private collection. If the photographs were for circulation, they tended to be for circulation only among the customer's intimate friends.

Senator SPECTER. Is there any other trend of sexual exploitation besides prostitution and pornography?

Dr. WEISBERG. Well, certainly there are more organized forms of prostitution in terms of escort agencies, for example. This tends to be more common for female prostitutes, sometimes including adolescent females, than for male prostitutes. It exists, of course, but to a much lesser extent.

We also found that the traditional social service approach often fails in reaching these adolescents in terms of serving their needs. The youth generally do not have the ability to seek the assistance they need. They tend to have emergency needs, especially the runaway prostitutes, for housing, food, medical care, crisis counseling. The youth tend to be so unskilled that they do not know which public agencies might assist them.

Senator SPECTER. How effective are the police and other law enforcement in controlling prostitution?

Dr. WEISBERG. The police are a very important intervention. They are often the first people to come into contact with these juveniles. However, we found they are often ineffective as deterrents. In fact, the police, that is, the law enforcement officers with whom we spoke, were the first to admit this. We found that they could not deal with the youth's underlying problems, the roots of the problems. The juveniles who were arrested tended to be counseled and released and they were soon back on the streets. On the other hand, the runaway shelters, by and large, were the most effective intervention strategies. They were equipped to meet the emergency needs of these runaways, the critical needs they have for housing——

Senator SPECTER. Your prepared testimony indicates that you come down on the side of the runaway shelters as the most effective means of assistance. What is your determination of the adequacy of existing facilities?

Dr. WEISBERG. Existing facilities? Are you talking about funding or the specific shelters themselves?

Senator SPECTER. Take it both ways.

Dr. WEISBERG. Well, in terms of the specific facilities, we found that in the large cities we studied, there were fine runaway shelters which served both runaways and runaway prostitutes. They are a major source of assistance in terms of filling the youths specific needs, specific emergency needs. Of course, many programs have aggressive outreach components so that they are out there on the street where the youth congregate and they are able to help them with their more critical problems.

In terms of funding, certainly I would strongly urge continued funding of the Runaway Youth Act. Most of the runaway shelters with which——

Senator SPECTER. Is $6.6 million adequate?

Dr. WEISBERG. Hardly. Most of the shelters I am familiar with operate on a shoe string.

Senator SPECTER. If you were the Commissioner, or beyond that the Secretary, or beyond that the President, what figure would you put on that?

Dr. WEISBERG. The present figures of $11 million are woefully inadequate to deal with the runaway population. Certainly I would urge continued funding and that the appropriation should be augmented. These programs really are shoestring operations. Considering the alternatives that exist in the juvenile justice system, they are a very effective way of spending money. It is much more efficient to operate a small shelter than it is to operate institutions, secure facilities or nonsecure facilities for these juveniles.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Dr. Weisberg.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Weisberg and additional material follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF D. KELLY WEISBERG

Urban and Rural Systems Associates (URSA), a social policy research firm in San Francisco, California, was awarded a contract from the Youth Development Bureau (YDB), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), in October 1979, to conduct a study of adolescent prostitution with a special focus on adolescent male prostitution. The purposes of the study were: (1) to develop a Resource Manual for community policy-makers and program planners who work with both male and female adolescent prostitutes; (2) to gather data on the little-researched problem of adolescent male prostitution; (3) to compare adolescent male and adolescent female prostitution; and (4) to examine the relationship between adolescent prostitution, runaway behavior, child pornography and other forms of sexual exploitation. I was a Senior Research Associate on this study and am currently a professor of juvenile and family law at Hastings College of the Law, University of California, San Francisco. Bruce Fisher, an URSA Partner, was the Project Director of the study.*

The findings of URSA's two-year national study are quite extensive and are described in the Executive Summary attached to this prepared statement. Briefly, URSA's research suggests the following:

- Juvenile prostitution is a widespread and an increasing social problem that is present in many small communities as well as most large metropolitan areas of the country;
- A significant number of adolescent prostitutes are male; while a great many of these youth are not gay-identified and prostitute primarily for

---

*On behalf of URSA, Mr. Fisher has also directed national studies on child abuse and neglect, adolescent maltreatment, family violence and juvenile corrections.

economic survival, an increasing number identify as sexual minority youth;

- A large proportion of adolescent prostitutes, both female and male, are runaways;
- Most communities rely on law enforcement approaches to deal with adolescent prostitutes; yet such efforts are generally ineffective as deterrents;
- Traditional social service programs fail to meet the specific needs of this population, in part because adolescent prostitutes are a difficult client population to serve; and
- Runaway shelters, because of their expertise and flexibility in working with troubled adolescents, are a major source of assistance to adolescent prostitutes.

URSA's research reveals that adolescent prostitution is a complex phenomenon. We discovered that, contrary to many media accounts, there is no stereotypical adolescent prostitute. Rather, these youth represent a diverse subpopulation with a broad range of needs and problems. In short, they are a high risk population.

Physical and sexual abuse characterize the childhood histories of adolescent male and female prostitutes. Almost two-thirds of adolescent female prostitutes and one-third of adolescent male prostitutes report being _physically_ abused by a family member. Adolescent prostitutes are _sexually_ victimized by family members as well. From 30 to 75 percent of adolescent female prostitutes and from 10 to 36 percent of adolescent male prostitutes are sexually abused by family members. Nearly one-half of adolescent female prostitutes and one-quarter of adolescent male prostitutes report the onset of sexual abuse at age ten or younger.

Most adolescent prostitutes (as many as 75%) fail to complete high school. The majority of these youth drop out of school between the eighth and tenth grades. Both adolescent male and female prostitutes tend to have poor employment histories and are not otherwise employed when they turn to prostitution. The few adolescent prostitutes who have work experience tend to be employed in unskilled short-term, part-time positions.

Adolescent prostitutes, both female and male, tend to have extensive runaway histories. Runaways comprise from 75 to 100 percent of adolescent female prostitutes, compared to 42 to 77 percent of adolescent male prostitutes. Many youth run away from the sexual and physical abuse they experience at home. Approximately three-fourths of adolescent prostitutes (both male and female) cite family conflicts as a reason for leaving home. Parental disapproval of the youth's sexual activity is a major factor mentioned by runaway prostitutes which contributes to their leaving home. For adolescent females, these family conflicts about sexuality often concern early heterosexual promiscuity. For a significant number of adolescent male prostitutes, these conflicts center on homosexuality.

Additionally, adolescent female prostitutes risk violence and sexual assaults by pimps and customers, as well as drug addiction. They are also characterized by extreme negative feelings of self-esteem.

URSA has identified three types of adolescent male prostitutes: situational, habitual, and vocational. Each type has its needs and problems.

- Habitual hustlers are youth involved in lower-class, inner-city street life, for whom prostitution is an integral part of a delinquent street lifestyle. Many of these youth are not gay-identified but, rather, prostitute for economic survival.
- Situational hustlers are youth who prostitute only under certain circumstances or in particular situations and who view prostitution as a temporary activity. Many of these youth are gay-identified and prostitute in the context of the gay male subculture.
- Vocational (and avocational) hustlers are youth who view prostitution as a job, full-time or part-time, and who are committed to prostitution as a career. These youth are often gay-identified and cater to the gay male subculture.

The habitual male prostitute is most at risk. For this youth, prostitution is an integral part of a street lifestyle which also includes dealing in drugs, petty theft, robbery, and other acts of delinquency. He lives and works in the inner-city sex trade zones of major metropolitan areas, making him vulnerable to drug and alcohol abuse, violence, feelings of depression, and sometimes suicide.

The situational hustler engages in prostitution on an occasional basis--for income, adventure or sexual experimentation. He is at risk of becoming an habitual hustler, for his occasional acts of prostitution may lead to greater commitment to the hustling lifestyle. The vocational hustler faces some of the same problems as the other types of adolescent prostitutes. He too suffers from the lack of educational and employment experiences.

Few programs exist to meet the peeds of these youth and their families. The runaway prostitute is an especially difficult population for traditional social service systems to reach. In part, this stems from the fact that many adolescent prostitutes will not seek services. The adolescent females fear reprisals from pimps; both male and female prostitutes fear referrals to law enforcement agencies; and both are difficult to wean from the perceived attraction of prostitution. In addition, many gay-identified adolescent male prostitutes are difficult to reach because they fear the stigma and insensitivity of social service providers occasioned by the youth's status as sexual minority youth.

Most communities rely on law enforcement to deal with adolescent prostitutes. However, almost every respondent, including law enforcement officials, with whom URSA spoke concur that such efforts are generally ineffective to address the adolescents' needs and problems, to deter youth from further acts of prostitution, or enable them to exit from prostitution. In addition, many adolescent prostitutes never come to the attention of law enforcement unless the youth are perpetrators or victims of violence.

One of the most successful intervention agencies to assist adolescent prostitutes is the runaway shelter. Some of these shelters are located in geographical areas accessible to adolescent prostitutes. A number have aggressive outreach efforts, e.g., streetwork, in the downtown sex trade zones where these youth congregate. Many runaway shelters provide the services these youth urgently need: medical care, emergency housing, food, crisis and long-term counseling, and vocational training.

Several runaway shelters URSA studied have exemplary programs serving adolescent prostitutes. Among the noteworthy programs are: The Shelter in Seattle, New Bridge in Minneapolis, Bridge Over Troubled Waters in Boston, Central City Hospitality House and Huckleberry House in San Francisco. These runaway houses, as well as other runaway shelters, are presently confronting the possibility of serious cutbacks in funding. In fact, New Bridge in Minneapolis has closed its doors since our study because of a lack of funding. Many programs are presently considering eliminating special services or outreach efforts directed at adolescent prostitutes because of funding constraints. Should federal funds be unavailable for such runaway programs, most of these agencies indicated that they would be unable to find alternative local sources of funding.

One client who will suffer most from reduced funding of runaway youth programs is the adolescent prostitute--the youth whose needs are rarely met by other social service providers. Because of the abusive family situations from which many of these youth originate, the family system has failed these youth; the necessity arises for public intervention. Should these programs not be allowed to continue, the sordid world of prostitution, drugs, and violence may characterize the lives of an increasing number of adolescents.

URSA Urban and Rural Systems Associates
Pier 1-1/2, San Francisco, California 94111
415 398-2040

ADOLESCENT PROSTITUTION: A STUDY OF SEXUAL EXPLOITATION, ETIOLOGICAL FACTORS, AND RUNAWAY BEHAVIOR WITH A FOCUS ON ADOLESCENT MALE PROSTITUTES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BRUCE FISHER
PROJECT DIRECTOR

TOBY MAROTTA
RESEARCH ETHNOGRAPHER

NOEL DAY

ERNIE FAZIO

TOBY JOHNSON

MICHELLE MAGEE

D. KELLY WEISBERG

JULY, 1982

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Description of the Study

In October 1979, Urban and Rural Systems Associates (URSA), a social policy research and consulting firm based in San Francisco, was awarded a contract from the Youth Development Bureau* to conduct a national study of juvenile prostitution, with a focus on adolescent male prostitution. A major aim of the study was the development of a Resource Manual for policy-makers and program planners which describes community intervention strategies and program approaches for adolescent prostitutes, both male and female.

A second major purpose of the study was to develop an in-depth knowledge base on adolescent males involved in prostitution and to compare this to existing knowledge of adolescent female prostitutes. In addition, URSA was asked to examine the relationship between adolescent male prostitution and adolescent male involvement in pornography and related sexual exploitation activities.

---

*The Youth Development Bureau is within the Administration for Children, Youth and Famlies in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

The major products of the study include:

- A **Resource Manual** which reviews demographic and behavioral data on adolescent males and females involved in prostitution, describes various community efforts to coordinate services for adolescent prostitutes, and presents current programmatic approaches and intervention strategies for working with the juvenile prostitute.
- A **Report on Adolescent Male Prostitution**, including descriptive information based on an ethnographic study and demographic and behavioral data derived from the development of individual hustler profiles and a review of relevant research. In addition, this Report contains a review of the literature on adolescent female prostitution and a comparison of data on adolescent male prostitution with that on female prostitution.
- A **Report on Adolescent Male Prostitution, Pornography and Other Forms of Sexual Exploitation**, which documents the lack of relationship between adolescent male prostitution and pornography, pederasty, and commercial sexual exploitation; and
- An **Annotated Bibliography**, which abstracts the recent literature on both adolescent male and female prostitution and related topics, and includes other bibliographic materials in the area of prostitution generally.

These reports were developed from five major sources. Discussions were held in seven cities across the country with staff of programs involved in service delivery to juvenile prostitutes and with other relevant service providers, including law enforcement officers, mental health workers and physicians.

An ethnographic study was conducted by an URSA ethnographer with previous experience researching sexual subcultures. He lived for several months in the Tenderloin area of San Francisco and informally observed and talked with hundreds of adolescent male hustlers, their customers and other residents of the hustling world, including those involved in the sale of sexually explicit materials. The ethnographer also lived for four weeks in the Times Square area of New York City conducting similar research activities.

Hustler profiles were developed by URSA in order to provide demographic and behavioral data on a sample of 79 adolescent males currently involved in prosittution. Specific profile data were reported to URSA by program staff and other researchers across the country who cooperated in this research effort.

An extensive literature review was conducted which focused on both male and female prostitution, including an in-depth review of all recent research efforts in the field.

A wealth of information has been generated by this research and is discussed at length in the major reports of the study. For the purposes of this Executive Summary, the major findings of the study are presented in three basic areas: (1) a description of adolescent males involved in prostitution and a comparison of these young men to females involved in prostitution; (2) a discussion of the relationship between adolescent male prostitution, pornography and other sexual exploitation activities; and, (3) a description of community efforts and programmatic approaches for working with juvenile prostitutes.

MAJOR FINDINGS

1) CHARACTERISTICS OF ADOLESCENT MALE PROSTITUTES AND COMPARISON TO ADOLESCENT FEMALE PROSTITUTES

- The majority of adolescent prostitutes appear to be at least 16 years old. The numbers of younger adolescents involved in prostitution, those 13 and 14 years old, appear to be few.

  While apparently on the increase, the number of youth involved in prostitution is difficult to estimate because of a variety of factors. These factors include the youth's mobility, the dificulty of ascertaining their exact age, the scarcity of arrests for juvenile prostitution, and the occasional and transitory nature of many youth's involvement in prostitution. There appears to be an increasing number of adolescent males involved in prostitution, and this increase appears to be related to the growth of the gay subculture and the liberation of gay attitudes.

- There are significant differences between adolescent males and females involved in prostitution. While many males are gay-identified, most females are not. While most males are independent, freelance hustlers, most females have pimps or operate from organizations such as massage parlors and escort services. While most males involved in hustling are situational hustlers, many young women prostitutes tend to become much more committed to prostitution as a lifestyle. Adolescent males involved in hustling often form a close-knit social network marked by mutual support and camaraderie, whereas female prostitutes are characterized more by feelings of isolation and competititve attitudes toward other female prostitutes.

  Another area of major difference between adolescent male and female prostitutes involves their attitudes toward prostitution and their self-images. Young men involved in gay-identified prostitution indicate they enjoy prostutition, including its sexual aspects; most women indicate a strong dislike for the sexual activity involved in prostitution. The females prostitute primarily for the money. A significant number of males prostitute for other reasons as well, including sociability, excitement and adventure.

  Prior research on female prostitution indicates that most female prostitutes have negative self-images. These feelings of low self-esteem often originate in childhood as a result of sexual abuse and physical abuse. These sentiments are often reinforced by the negative labeling of the youth as promiscuous, runaway, or delinquent. This labeling occurs informally by family and peers, and formally by the educational and criminal justice systems. This negative feeling of self-worth allows a young woman to drift into a active involvement in prostitution and makes her more vulnerable to the attentions of a pimp. Once actively involved in prostitution, many young women feel they have lost any opportunity for a "normal" and "decent" life. They become dependent upon their pimp and drugs and increasingly depressed. These feelings of hopelessness and depression combined with an aversion to the sexual aspects of prostitution reinforce their negative self-images (James, 1980).

- Despite their differences, there are important similarities between adolescent male and female prostitutes. The majority have backgrounds characterized by broken homes, physical, sexual or emotional abuse, school failure and a history of runaway and delinquent behavior. Likewise, many young male and female prostitutes lead lives characterized by drug and alcohol abuse, violence and criminal behavior. Many turn to prostitution for economic survival. Some remain involved in prostitution because it appears "exciting" or "glamorous." However, unless they are able to leave prostitution before becoming committed to the lifestyle, many of these young men and women become trapped in a drug-oriented, violent and self-destructive subculture from which they might never escape.

- While a great many adolescent males involved in prostitution are not gay-identified and prostitute primarily for economic survival, an increasing number of young male prostitutes identify as sexual minority youth. As a result, a substantial percentage of adolescent male prostitutes, even a majority in some large cities, prostitute in the context of the gay subculture.

- Adolescent male prostitutes have been observed working in two distinct environments--the "sex trade zone" and the "gay neighborhood." Those prostitutes who work primarily in the "sex trade zone" are especially at risk. These youth often have severe personal and societal problems and are, therefore, more apt to become habitual hustlers. They are often the most problem-ridden of all males involved in prostitution. Those young male hustlers who work in the "gay neighborhood" and who are gay-identified are less likely to be involved in the violence that permeates the subculture of the sex trade zone. These young men are also more likely to be situational hustlers, for whom prostitution is not a primary, but an occasional activity.

- Adolescent male prostitutes can generally be organized into types based upon differing levels of involvement in prostitution. These types can be characterized as situational, habitual, and vocational. A situational hustler is a young man who hustles only under certain circumstances or only in particular situations, and who views hustling as being a temporary activity. An habitual hustler is a young man involved in the lower class, inner-city street life for whom hustling sex has become an integral part of a street lifestyle which also includes involvement in drugs and alcohol, petty theft, minor assaults and other acts of delinquency. **Vocational hustlers** are young men who view selling themselves for sex as a career, often gay-identified and catering to the gay male subculture. **Avocational** hustlers are vocational hustlers who hustle part-time to supplement the income they receive from other jobs.

2) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADOLESCENT MALE PROSTITUTION, PORNOGRAPHY AND OTHER FORMS OF COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

- In recent years, numerous crusaders and journalists have indiscriminately lumped adolescent male prostitution with female prostitution, pornography, child abuse, pedophilia, rape and other forms of sexual exploitation. The research conducted in this study, including discussions with staff from juvenile prostitution programs, researchers on male and female prostitution, law enforcement officials, and operators of sexually explicit movie houses and bookstores, as well as contacts with adolescent male prostitutes across the country, strongly suggest that there is little relationship between adolescent male prostitution and other commercial sexual exploitation activities.

- As noted in our findings on adolescent males involved in prostitution, most male hustlers, whether gay-identified youth hustling occasionally in the "gay neighborhoods" or habitual hustlers working in the "sex trade zone," operate as independent free-lance hustlers. They do not have pimps, and the vast majority do not operate from organized agencies such as escort services, massage parlors or houses of prostitution.

- Most customers of male prostitutes--called johns, tricks or clients--are men exploring their homosexual feelings. To the extent that hustlers and johns are gay-identified, much adolescent male prostitution takes place in the context of attitudes and customs characteristic of the gay male subculture.

- Exploitation involving adolescent males is more likely to occur for the habitual hustler in the sex trade zones. It is in this environment that most violence and economic exploitation involving adolescent male prostitutes occur. Here, however, both hustler and john are equally likely to be the exploiter. These youth are likely to rob their victims or assault them. These customers tend to be more isolated, more conflicted about their sexuality, more disturbed and, thus, more violent.

- Few customers are attracted to prepubescent or pubescent boys. URSA's research suggests that pedophilia, i.e., sexual interest in young children, is a distinct phenomenon unrelated to adolescent male prostitution. In fact, most pedophiliacs exhibit a sexual interest in both male and female children, and focus on the age of the child rather than the gender. The extent to which pedophilia is organized, and the numbers of adults and children involved, was outside the focus of this study. It appears, however, from our study of adolescent male prostitution, that reports suggesting a well-organized, nationwide traffic in younger children for sexual purposes may well be exaggerated.

- Historically and at present, male prostitution has been associated only tangentially with the production of sexually explicit materials directed at gay men. Only a small percentage of these materials involve male teengers. In this country, the production and distribution of sexually explicit materials involving adolescent males appears to be limited to small-scale, non-commercial activities by individuals. Furthermore, since the passage of federal legislation on the protection of children against sexual exploitation in 1977, much of the sexually explicit commercial materials involving adolescent males appear to be produced and distributed outside the United States. In addition, these materials have been and are a very different genre from sexually explicit materials directed at pedophiliacs which involve younger children.

3) COMMUNITY EFFORTS AND PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES FOR WORKING WITH JUVENILE PROSTITUTES

Community Efforts

- Almost every metropolitan community in the country has some adolescents, male and female, involved in prostitution. However, most communities fail to recognize the existence of this hustling population, particularly to the extent that it involves adolescent males. Thus, few communities have developed significant efforts to deal with adolescent prostitution or to provide services to this population. Where services are provided, they most often focus on the adolescent female prostitute. Only in a few communities have services been developed for adolescent male prostitutes as well.

- In most communities, law enforcement intervention has been seen as the appropriate response to adolescent prostitution. Law enforcement intervention, however, has usually not been successful in deterring individual youth from further acts of prostitution nor in reducing the incidence of juvenile prostitution generally.

- A few communities have coordinated efforts to address the problem of adolescent prostitution. While the approach employed by each of these communities has been unique and has reflected its own conditions and limitations, there are a number of common characteristics. These include:

  1) a social service emphasis which focuses on serving the needs of adolescent prostitutes and de-emphasizes a prosecution-oriented, law enforcement approach;

  2) an approach which specifically targets adolescent prostitutes as the client and recognizes the special needs and problems of this populaion;

  3) a community-wide effort which includes a coalition of agencies, involving runaway youth shelters, community-based mental health programs, adolescent medical clinics and gay-identified community-based social service agencies. In some communities, law enforcement has also been an integral component of the coalition; and

  4) a significant effort to educate the community generally on the problems of adolescent prostitution and the needs of individual adolescent prostitutes. Additionally, these include efforts to provide professional training to a wide variety of service providers, who have contact with adolescent prostitutes.

- Times of economic hardship will constrain the community's ability to intervene successfully with young prostitutes through employment training and alternative jobs and may exacerbate the phenomenon. URSA's Resource Manual emphasizes the importance of developing alternatives that can successfully compete with the perceived attraction of the prostitution lifestyle, characterized in part by parties, drugs, and "easy money." To the extent that the 1980s continue to experience recession and cutbacks in government social service programs, including job training and job development programs, the ability of communities to intervene successfully in the lives of young prostitutes will become increasingly questionable.

Indeed, continued recession may increase the incidence of adolescent prostitution. Although various reasons contribute to young people's involvement in prostitution, the desire for money is a primary factor in almost every prostitute's decision to sell sexual favors. To the extent that unemployment continues to rise and public support programs continue to contract, an increase in the number of young men and women turning to prostitution for survival might be anticipated.

Program Approaches

- There are relatively few agencies which serve adolescent prostitutes despite their increasing numbers and the notoriety they receive from the media. Among existing programs, no single type of agency is most effective in serving the adolescent prostitute. Successful programs known to this study have included runaway youth projects, community-based social service agencies, medical clinics, community-based mental health programs and community-based, gay-identified social service programs.

- A comprehensive multi-service approach to working with adolescent prostitutes is considered to be the most effective response to the problem. The single most important component of any program designed to serve adolescent prostitutes is outreach and the most effective outreach strategy is streetwork. In addition, program services should include careful intake and needs assessment as well as emergency short-term and long-term residential services. Additionally, a full range of emergency support services should be provided, including skills training for independent living, employment counseling and job development. Comprehensive programs should also offer counseling services designed to assist youth in dealing with issues of sexuality, sexual identification and family dynamics.

- There are two phases of an adolescent's involvement in prostitution which appear to provide the most effective opportunities for significant program intervention. The first is during the early phases of the youth's involvement in prostitution, prior to becoming an habitual hustler (if male) or prior to "assimilation and commitment," if female (James, 1980).

A second opportunity for intervention occurs when the youth is in crisis. Adolescent prostitutes may be in crisis related to drug or alcohol use, violence, arrest and/or severe depression. An adolescent prostitute may also be in crisis when he or she has a strong desire to exit from prostitution but is unable to do so. These events provide a significant opportunity for a program to assist youth in exiting from prostitution.

- Improved intrafamilial relationships, especially those designed to impact family dysfunction, would reduce the incidence of juvenile prostitution. Most young prostitutes come from broken homes (i.e., divorced or separated parents), and many have been victims of parental abuse or neglect. The majority have run away from or been thrown out of unhealthy family situations. These youth include an increasing number of gay-identified young men whose sexual preferences are not accepted by parents and siblings. Once on the street, some of these youth become involved in prostitution.

The breakdown of the traditional nuclear family has occasioned much concern from social commentators for several years. That breakdown has been blamed for increases in psycho-social problems ranging from school failure to drug abuse and delinquency, violent crime to suicide, and from child and adolescent abuse to child and adolescent prostitution. In order to reduce the incidence of family related problems, including adolescent prostitution, society must develop specific programs and support systems to prevent family breakdown, to assist victims of family breakdown, and to intervene in generational patterns of family dysfunction.

The last decade has witnessed the development of many significant interventions in the area of family-related abuse and violence: training and community education projects in child abuse and neglect, direct support and counseling services to families at risk, and crisis and long-term residential programs for child and spousal victims. Such programs should be maintained and supplemented if we are to impact on juvenile prostitution.

Another family-related implication of this study is the significant number of young, gay-identified hustlers who leave their homes as a result of conflicts about their sexual preferences and lifestyles. The URSA study indicates that such conflicts not only inhibit the possible reunion of these youth and their families, but are also an important factor in the apparent increase of adolescent male prostitution.

Without addressing the underlying family conflicts that have led to an increase in adolescent male prostitution, as well as the more general issues of child and adolescent abuse and family violence, public policies designed to reduce the incidence of juvenile prostitution will likely fail.

Senator **Specter**. Next we are pleased to hear from Dotson Rader who is a writer for Parade magazine who has been touring the country gathering information on this problem and the problem of runaways.

We welcome you here, Mr. Rader. Your statement will be made a part of the record and we will be pleased to hear your experiences and your views and your findings on this.

STATEMENT OF DOTSON RADER

Mr. **Rader**. First, I want to thank you, Senator Specter, and Senator Kennedy, for your interest and support of runaway children.

Parade, as you know, is the largest read publication in the United States. We have around 50 million readers every Sunday.

For the first time in our 43-year history, we are following up a cover story with another cover story. I have just come from New York where I wrote the cover story on runaway children which will appear shortly before the November elections. The reason we do that is because we received around 70,000 pieces of mail on the story on runaway children in February. The magazine, the editors of the magazine, are determined to make the problem of runaway children one of the chief social priorities facing this country and this Government.

Senator **Specter**. How serious is the problem, in your judgment?

Mr. **Rader**. Well, I just got back from 2½ months traveling around the country. This is my second tour. It is worse than when I was out there 10 months ago. There are more runaways today.

Senator **Specter**. Where did you go?

Mr. **Rader**. New York, Washington, Seattle, San Diego, Chula Vista, Los Angeles, Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Lake Tahoe, Las Vegas, Key West.

Senator **Specter**. Any small towns besides the illustrious ones like Lake Tahoe and Key West?

Mr. **Rader**. No. Well, Chula Vista ain't that big a town and it is not that pretty a town, either.

I will give you some figures. We have had our research department on this issue for some time and there are a million, a conservative estimate of a million runaway children each year.

Senator **Specter**. That is a conservative figure?

Mr. **Rader**. That is conservative.

Senator **Specter**. What do you think it is accurately?

Mr. **Rader**. I would say a 1½ or 2 million. It is growing by 5 percent a year. The State of New Mexico, whose two Senators are opposed to the increased funding for runaway youth, the increase in the number of runaway children the last 5 years has averaged 18 percent a year. In San Diego——

Senator **Specter**. One of the Senators was very helpful restoring the funds to the Runaway Youth Act.

Mr. **Rader**. Senator, forgive me. I do not think $10.5 million funding is anywhere near adequate. It is shameful. It shames the Nation. I think the funding ought to at least be $25 million, to begin with, and I think even that is inadequate.

What happens is if you go around the country to runaway centers, who deal with a very small percentage of these children, you visit a center, as I did in Albuquerque. Most of those children in that runaway center are not runaways. They are children that are sent to the centers by the courts, taken from, say, families that are abusing their children but are not in point of fact runaway children. A lot of the statistics that the Federal Government comes up with on the numbers of children, allegedly runaway, being helped—in fact many are not runaways.

Senator **Specter**. What are they?

Mr. **Rader**. What?

Senator **Specter**. You say they are not runaways.

Mr. **Rader**. They are children involved in various aspects of juvenile delinquency and rather than being put in secure facilities, they are put in runaway shelters and most of the beds, in my experience, in the shelters I have visited around the country, the children in those centers were in point of fact not runaways.

Runaways, and I have interviewed hundreds and hundreds of them—in fact two of the children I interviewed in October-November are already dead. Fifty-three percent of runaway children run away from home because of physical abuse. Thirty-five percent of runaway children flee home because of incest. The rest of the children——

Senator **Specter**. Is that applicable to both sexes?

Mr. **Rader**. Both male and female. The remaining children leave home largely because they are abandoned. They are what are known as throwaway children. I have talked to many of them. Their parents simply move on and abandon the children.

Senator **Specter**. What is your basis for those statistics? Those are very revealing statistics. When you say 35 percent leave home because of incest——

Mr. **Rader**. We have done a survey of various organizations, like the network and so on, plus the Government's own figures, and what we have done is compiled figures that come down on the side of what we think is the more conservative estimate. The average age of a runaway child is 12 years old. The average runaway in America 10 years ago, the average runaway was 15. It is now 12. The average runaway is a girl, white. Eighty percent of runaways are white. They come from middle-class and upper-middle-class families. The average runaway that is on the street more than 4 weeks ends up in prostitution and a child that ends up in prostitution will remain a prostitute for about 3 years. The average composite picture of johns that buy these children is married, middle class, white, who has children roughly the same age at home.

I think, sir, if I may presume to say it, if you judge a civilization on how it treats the weakest among its people, the most powerless, then I think justice would condemn this society because the weakest among us, those who cannot vote, who cannot get jobs, who have no homes, who are on the street, who have to sell their bodies to eat—that is why they turn to prostitution. For these children we are allocating—what was it, $6.6 million? That is what the wonderful, generous Government is giving to these children. That works out per child less than it costs to have lunch at the Senate-subsidized dining room. I think it is shameful. I think it is shameful that the majority of missing children are never reported as missing by their parents.

Let me tell you one case.

Senator SPECTER. Before you take up the case, I would like to pursue the statistic of incest. You say 30 to 35 percent. You say that runs both sexes. You are saying——

Mr. RADER. It has not been broken down. The figure we came up with——

Senator SPECTER. Fathers to daughters, mothers to sons——

Mr. RADER. It is often——

Senator SPECTER. Is incest between brothers and sisters?

Mr. RADER. No. Incest by older—stepfather, older brother, uncle, father with either girl or boy sibling—child, rather, in the family.

Senator SPECTER. So that would comprehend older male to younger female?

Mr. RADER. And older male to younger male and also older female to younger male.

May I tell you just a short story, Senator? One of the children—in fact, we got him out of San Diego last week because his life had been threatened. It is a boy named—called Patrick who when he was 12 years old, his mother had incest with him and attempted it with his younger brother who was 10. He was badly beaten up by his stepfather and so was his younger brother. He was removed by the court, put in the custody of his grandparents who lived in Oregon. So he was taken from California to Oregon. When he was 14 years old his grandfather sold him to a woman in San Diego for $500. He lived with that woman for about a year and a half and then fled, ran away. That is when I came upon him. The woman he had been sold to was involved in drug dealing in San Diego, specializing in morphine and marihuana and has bragged to him and other children of having a 16-year-old boy killed that she had bought previously, murdered because he had run from her.

I could sit here for 3 days telling you horror stories of children that I have interviewed. I do not think that is the point.

The point is the Government of the United States and the Congress of the United States indifference to these children has been shocking. It is horrific. It is shameful.

Senator SPECTER. What is the answer?

Mr. RADER. I will tell you what the answer is. If you have a runaway center—I think it is three blocks from here. It has been there for 7 years and in 7 years not a single Member of Congress has taken the time to walk three blocks to talk to children that are in terrible need. I think the answer, sir, is massive funding. It is to make it a public issue, where the American people are conscious of it, where they think about it, where they worry about it, first of all. And second, what I find is the—my rage over this is so great, in every State in this Union there are laws on the books against incest, against child abuse, against child abandonment. They are rarely enforced.

In Seattle, whose mayor, Mr. Royer, and whose head of the vice squad I talked to several weeks ago—it is always the little children on the street who are arrested for prostitution. They are held in detention for about 30 minutes and then released and are back on the streets. It looks great on the vice squad's record. It does not help the children. The Johns are never arrested.

As regards the pimps, in Seattle in the 10 months since I was there—there were no pimps 10 months ago. Pimps have now moved in. Organized crime has moved in to adolescent prostitution area. Both boys and girls in Los Angeles, in New York—in New York you can buy a child, a runaway child for $5,000 for life to do whatever you want with him. Runaway children have a very high mortality rate. They have a high mortality rate because they suffer from malnutrition. They do not have health insurance so they do not have access to medical care.

One of the leading causes of death among runaway boys is rectal hemorrhage. I can take you this afternoon to New York to various playlands and fantasy houses and video games and we can buy a 9-year-old boy, 10-year-old girl. Children get off a bus at Port Authority in New York, and the estimate is 400,000 runaways a year that come to New York City, and there are around 400 beds available for those children on an emergency basis. That is simply warehousing the children. They get off at Port Authority. The pretty ones, boys and girls, are picked up by pimps. I have talked to Mayor Koch about this. I have talked to Nancy Reagan about this. I have talked to mayors, politicians, Senators about this and you get a sense of concern and nothing is done. The children are put in safe houses. They are beaten up over a period of 4 to 6 weeks. They are addicted to heroin. Pimps control them. This is organized crime. In New York City, child prostitution, organized prostitution, child prostitution is controlled by organized crime. As is child pornography. When a boy suffers hemorrhage, he is dumped and nobody gives a good God damn and I think it is shameful.

I think it is shameful we would spend—the whole idea that voluntary contributions for these children are going to make up for tax dollars is an obscenity and anyone that would think that has got to be sick. To think that the First Lady of this Nation would take the time to raise $800,000-some for plates, which is more than the funding for runaway centers in five States, I think that is obscene. I think there is something wrong with the values of this country and I think it is something you have got to see for yourself. I cannot speak for these children. I wish you had the children here. I cannot bring hundreds of children here. I can just tell you about them. So it is on your conscience that these children's lives depend.

Senator SPECTER. Well, Mr. Rader, that is a powerful piece of testimony and I know that it comes from your heart and from a lot of experience and this subcommittee is very much concerned about this problem and we have demonstrated that. We have fought for what little there is in the funding process and we shall continue to do so and it may be that we should hear from the children because the level of communication, regrettably, in our society, turns on the dramatization of testimony.

Mr. RADER. May I say one thing? This is the second hearing I have been at. I have talked to lots of people in the field. Nobody ever believes the children. You get a lot of crap from the parents. It is always the kid's fault. You get a lot of bureaucratese from the endless agencies. No one ever listens to the children.

If I could take 51 percent of the Senate of the United States and 51 percent of the House of Representatives out on the streets of this town or any major city in America for 2 hours and let them see what these children's lives are like, I do not think they could sleep at night. I have trouble sleeping at night.

[Article from Parade February 7, 1982, follows:]

[Parade Feb. 7, 1982]

RUNAWAYS

THE AVERAGE AGE IS 15 AND MOST DEPEND ON PROSTITUTION OR THEFT TO SURVIVE

(By Dotson Radar)

Ann is a very pretty girl, with a round, childlike face, lovely smile and large brown eyes. She dresses colorfully and delights in collecting stuffed animals, bunnies mostly, and baby dolls. When she moves from one cheap hotel to another, as she frequently does, she piles her toys into two enormous plastic garbage bags and drags them with her.

Ann is 15. Like hundreds of other runaways, she hangs out around First and Post Streets in Seattle, a derelict in an area of porn shops, saloons, fleabag hotels. She sleeps late, spending her nights wandering the streets or sitting in the Donut Shop. While it's an unpleasant place, runaways feel welcome there, safe from the johns, pushers and pimps outside, and from the cops. For many, the Donut Shop is the only place they have to go.

Like Ann, all the children in this story are real. While their names have been changed, their stories are true. What they say here is typical of what hundreds of other kids told me across America, from Key West to Boston, and New York to Los Angeles.

This article centers on the runaways in Seattle and San Diego, cities chosen because they anchor the ends of U.S. I-5, the main road for kids on the run in the West. Also, they are representative places, largely middle class. These children could be from your town, from next door.

I sat opposite Ann at one of the long formica tables, under harsh fluorescent lights. I asked her why she didn't go home to her family.

"Everytime I try to go home to live, my Dad starts hitting me," she said. "Now I only go home on Christmas, Thanksgiving and on my birthday. I owe them that. I'd like to live at home again, but I know it would start all over again, Daddy drinking and beating me up. That's why I left. The first time I ran away, I was 11. When I was 12, I was gone for good, I got a job at the Exotic Body Exercise Club downtown near the Donut Shop.

"After I lost that job, I met this old man on the street. He said he needed a babysitter. I'd get paid well. He lived in a hotel in Chinatown. He had a prostitute there, and she had a baby I took care of. After a while, the old man made me a prostitute. I was 13 years old, and I had no place to go."The old man knew all these Japanese guys who'd come to the hotel for sex. Two or three times a week I'd turn tricks, usually five or six a night. They each paid the old man $40 for sex with me. He was good to me. Sometimes he gave me $7 to go to the disco, and $10 to spend. But I left him after nine months."

Ann glanced around the Donut Shop at the other kids. Then she learned forward, lowering her voice, not wanting the other children to hear. Her modesty was touching and sad.

"My parents never spoke to me about sex. What I knew about it I learned at the movies," she confided. "When I first did it, I'd drink before the sex happened, and then I'd pretend it wasn't happening to me. I'd think about pretty things, like I wasn't even there. The first time, I was scared because I didn't know what was going to happen. Then I didn't care anymore. I really only like sex with someone I love. Other times I'm indifferent. I'm very lucky, I haven't been hurt by a trick. A lot of kids have.

"After I left the pimp," she continued, "I started mudwrestling on weekends all over the country. I was 14."

Ann told me about the mud show circuit, how she was auctioned off after each match to the highest bidder, who then had the right to bathe her down. She added that her life was okay. Anyway, what choice did she have? Nobody since she first ran away had ever tried to help her. Nobody.

We left the Donut Shop. Kids were huddled in doorways or walking back and forth to keep warm, some as young as 10, waiting around in the cold for someone to stop and buy their bodies for a few dollars or a meal or a warm place to stay. Police cars cruised by, as did johns peering through closed car windows, looking for kids to pick up.

Up to 1 million children in the United States run away from home each year, according to the federal Health and Human Services Administration. And most, after a few weeks, turn to prostitution and theft for survival. The average age of a runaway child is 15.

Forty-seven percent of runaways are girls, the agency says. More than half leave home because of child abuse. One-third are sexually abused. Of these children, 83 percent come from white families. The majority are never even reported as missing by their parents. Knowing all that, it was still disheartening to see in Seattle so many kids with nowhere to go.

As we walked, Ann introduced me to other street children, two of whom I asked to interview. Most of the runways I met were unusually bright, attractive, lonely and hungry for adult regard and affection.

There were also johns who came up, trying to solicit Ann.

These men who have sex with children are almost entirely middle-class, usually married, and most often they have children at home about the same age as the child they violate, according to social workers. They are rarely arrested. When the police act, it is always against the children.

Before I left Ann, I asked how she envisioned her future. It was now after midnight. She stood near the entrance of a smut parlor, her small hands shoved in her jacket pockets, looking weak and defenseless. "Oh, I don't plan to be a prostitute for the rest of my life," she declared. "In Seattle, most of the runaway girls on the street end up in prostitution. It's do or die. The same with the boys. Do you know how hard it is for a kid to get a job in Seattle? She shook her head. "If I had my life to do all over again. I wouldn't live like this. I would have stayed home. I'd rather be abused at home than this. Seriously, I would." She paused.

"But it's too late now."

The following day I found Ann waiting in my hotel lobby with two of her friends, Daniel and Melanie.

Daniel, who just turned 15, is tall, handsome and unusually articulate. He told me about running away from home at 12, of being raped a week later by a middle-aged man in the back of a van and being too frightened to tell anybody. In almost deferential tones, he outlined his brief life—hitch-hiking up and down the West Coast. His was an account of sexual abuse, drugs, desperation and an aching need to belong somewhere, to somebody. Now he was working as a busboy. He wants to be a radio announcer. Someone told him he had the voice for it.

After speaking with Daniel, I talked with Melanie. She spoke rapidly, chain-smoking. There was a bravado in her manner, belied by her sorrowful gray eyes. She was 5 feet and underfed.

She told me about her parents' divorce and the death of her grandmother, whom she loved deeply. At 13 she became pregnant. She didn't know how pregnancies happened, she said. She left home when her mother forced her to abort the child. Melanie has been on the run since.

"I ran away on Christmas night about two months after the abortion." she said. "I hated Mom after that. One night I went to downtown Seattle. I met a guy named Jim. He was 18, and he'd been a runaway since he was 14. We got an apartment together. It was really a hotel for bums. I started tricking [prostitution] to get money for us because Jim was having a hard time of it. The johns wanted younger boys, 14, 15, and Jim was too old. When I first started tricking, I didn't let Jim know. I wanted him to think I was an innocent little girl. Now it doesn't bother him."

Melanie sat by the window in my room. It was an overcast day, but you could still see past the skyscrapers to the lake beyond and, farther still, the hills of the neighborhood where she had been reared.

"I used to live over there," she remarked. "It was a nice house."

Now she lived with Jim, who was a bum dealing drugs, drinking and hanging out. She loved him, but she hated prostitution, all her years lost to the streets. She felt trapped.

"I'm so tired of sex," Melanie said wearily. "It doesn't do me any good, sex with anybody, even Jim. I don't enjoy it anymore." She is 16 now.

I suggested that she return home. If she told her parents what she had been through, they would help.

She laughed. "My parents know I'm a prostitute," she said. "All my father says is, don't get arrested. He doesn't want it in the newspapers."

Before I left for San Diego, I took Daniel and Ann to the restaurant at the hotel. They ate a lot and talked as children will about all they are going to do in life and what shining futures awaited them, but I knew they didn't believe a word of it.

"I'm flying to California on Tuesday to go on the roller-coaster and see a guy down there named Walt," Ann boasted. "He's a television producer."

"I've been to Disneyland!" said Daniel. "Twice!"

She ignored him. "I met Walt at an amusement park last year in Santa Cruz. I went to his ranch and rode horses and drank lemonade. He likes little girls. He likes me."

I asked how old he was, this man who likes little girls.

"Sixty-five" Ann said.

When they finished eating, they said they had to go to the bathroom. As I waited for them to return, I grew wary and began to suspect they were conspiring to hit me for money.

When they returned, each had a small gift for me they had bought at the hotel's gift shop. A bottle of aftershave and a souvenir mug.

For three days in San Diego, a runway named Patrick took me to places where children on the lam gather. They're not hard to find. They sleep in the bus depot, or in the parks, particularly the area near the zoo. You find them in abandoned cars or empty houses or grouped around fires on beaches. They are everywhere.

Of the hundreds of children I met, Patrick was the most private. He was wounded inside, and the pain bred distrust and silence. He was 17, although he looked much younger. Blond, with blue-green eyes, he was small but athletic, liking gymnastics. Quiet, shy, suspicious. But despite that, he had a natural winsomeness, a ready smile and easy laugh joined by an insistent vulnerability that made him at once likeable and sad. He elicited in me, as did the others, a desire to protect. But he was different, possessed by an almost palpable rage. When I first asked about his life, he angrily refused to reply. So I let it go by.

On my second day, we drove to Chula Vista Park, where many runaways live. They survive by doing odd jobs, stealing, helping each other out.

We came to the park two days after the police had raided it, and we saw children with bruised faces and cuts on their heads. The police don't like children living in the parks.

Among the runaways I interviewed there was Steven, 15, from Ocean Beach, Cal. He ran away when he was 13, he said. Like most runaways, his chief concern was getting enough food and a dry place to sleep. He comes from a good family, but he can't go home again.

"Its frightening to be a runaway", Steven said, "because you don't know about tomorrow. You wonder where you're going to eat or live. Am I going to be all right?

Will I be able to sleep somewhere other than in the park? You got nothing to grab onto because all that you own is what's on your back. Nothing is mine. When I want something to eat, I steal it.

"When you run away, you meet a lot of kids who got no place," he added.

"Why don't kids want to go home?" I asked.

"Some of them get beat up so bad," he said. "But the streets are bad too. The cops hassle you. Sometimes they beat you up.

"I don't want to go home because I really hate my mother. When I was 13, she kicked me out.

"If I had a child who ran away. I'd find him. I'd do my best. I'd try to sit down and ask him what was on his mind. What's troubling you, kid? And after we talked, I'd try to change the things he didn't like. We'd compromise. I want to go back home, but I can't. I see how small I am. I'm nothing. God, I can't live on my own. It's mad out there. It's crazy! Whew! It's scary! I can't pay my own way. And I know it."

The day I was to leave San Diego, Patrick and I want to Ocean Beach to interview more runaways. I talked to a girl and a boy who lived in a brokendown car. And to a girl of 15 with a year-old baby, and her friend of 13. They had been traveling together for two years and could not see beyond tomorrow. Also, there were young runways spaced out on drugs or staggering about on cheap booze; children obviously undernourished, unhealthy, unwanted. America's children.

As the sun began to set, Patrick and I sat on the pier watching the light fade.

"I've had a pretty hard life," Patrick suddenly said, staring at the ocean.

I replied that I knew, although I didn't.

"I don't want to tell you all of it," he said. "I was always made to feel less." He sipped a beer as he sat hunched on the pier, his feet dangling above the water. "My mom hated me," he went on, "because I reminded her of my dad. I always knew she was bad, from the first day I can remember, like when I was 2 years old. She was always doing weird things, like wanting me and my little brother to take a bath with her." He stopped. I said nothing, for I sensed Patrick was trying to tell me what he had never told any other adult.

"She tried to do sexual stuff with us, too." he began again, staring out to sea as if he were addressing the ocean and not me. "To go to bed with her. All through my growing up she was always trying something with me, and my little brother too. She was dating a guy, and she had a girlfriend at the same time, and they were all sleeping in the same bed, running around naked all the time. It makes me sick. My own mother. I've blocked it all out. That's the only way I've survived.

Then when I was 13, I was sent to live with my grandparents," he said. "They cheated and lied. When I was 15, they sold me to a lady for $500. I ran away. So I never had a real family. I never saw my real father. I was always lonely . . . . I feel like there must be something wrong with me. How come no one ever loved me? I must be bad. I feel like I don't exist because nobody ever loved me.

"My mom used to beat me with boards," he continued. "You wouldn't believe some of the stuff she whipped me with. Hot wheel tracks. And my stepfather? He whipped me 25 times on the back of the legs with a rubber hose. I tried to block it, and I got hit on the hands. I counted every swat. Twenty-five times he hit me. And now he beats my little brother. How can I get even? I can't get even. But I'll remember it, believe me."

I asked Patrick if that was why he ran away, because of the beatings.

He looked at me, full of anger, and then he threw his beer can into the sea. He stood. We walked on the pier.

"I didn't want to be a runaway," he said, "I had no place to go. I didn't want to starve. I didn't want to steal. I had nowhere to go."

He stopped and grabbed my arm.

"No one ever helped me! Teach me, Help me! I need help. Seriously."

"I know." I pulled my arm free.

"There's a lot of things I don't know, and I'd like to learn. I want to learn to survive legally," he went on. "I don't have my ID, and I don't know how to get it. I'm willing to learn. I don't want to be a dummy all my life I don't want to be a bum, because I'm better than that. Do you understand where I'm coming from? I need to know things to survive! I don't know anything. I can barely read, to tell the honest truth. My mom never helped me with my schoolwork. They didn't care about me."

I looked at him, his eyes expressing beseechment, pain and deep humiliation. I can barely read.

"Patrick," I began, and gave up. I had no answer to give him.

We walked toward the fence separating the parking lot from the beach.

"Don't you think loving is hard?" he asked.

I said nothing.

He glanced at me, and then he declared manfully, "I never cry!"

With that, Patrick rushed to the fence, climbed it, and like a circus acrobat ran along the top of it quickly—away from me.

Senator **SPECTER**. Mr. Rader, I just have been told that we are going to deal with more of this issue. The next panel we are going to hear from will talk more about the nature of the problem.

We have not been able to locate children to come forward. We had children here at a prior hearing and we had a young man from Louisville, Ky., and others who did make a very forceful statement and when you talk about communications and emphasis, I quite agree with you that the children do tell the most poignant, most heart-rendering stories because the experiences are there. There is no question about that. It may well be that we will convene further hearings on this subject and hear more from the children.

We will await with interest your followup article. The one which was published on February 7 I think in Parade magazine did a great deal to awaken the conscience of this country. It is expansive readership you have and it is a matter which we have to continue to push. This subcommittee will do just that, to the extent of our power.

Thank you very much.

For our next panel we have Sister Barbara Whelan, Tommie Lee Jones, and Arnold Sherman.

Thank you for joining us today. Your statements will be made a part of the record. It is the custom of the subcommittee to summarize and give the maximum amount of time for dialog and questions.

We will start with you, Sister Whelan.

STATEMENTS OF PANEL CONSISTING OF: SISTER BARBARA WHELAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE BRIDGE OVER TROUBLED WATERS, INC., BOSTON, MASS.; TOMMIE LEE JONES, DIRECTOR, YOUTH IN ACTION, CHESTER, PA.; AND ARNOLD SHERMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, YOUTH NETWORK COUNCIL, CHICAGO, ILL.

Sister **WHELAN**. Bridge Over Troubled Waters began in 1970 as a street-based outreach program for runaways and homeless youth. Over the past 12 years, Bridge has become a comprehensive multiservice agency working with approximately 3,000 troubled children and youth each year. Since 1975, Bridge, in collaboration with Place Runaway House, has received a Federal runaway and homeless youth program grant.

As a multiservice youth agency Bridge works with a total group of 14 to 21 year old runaways, throw aways, street youth, drug and alcohol abusers, high school dropouts, prostitutes, gay hustlers, pregnant and parenting youth, formerly institutionalized youth, and delinquent young people with and without court involvement.

We provide prevention, treatment, and after-care services. We have counseling. We have an outreach program. We have street workers who literally work in the street, in the combat zone, in the bus terminal area where all the street runaway youngsters are apt to appear. We work with easily 3,000 individual kids in a given year.

Basically, today, I would like to focus on a couple of statements that Clarence Hodges, the Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families said.

First of all, he stated two issues that are of great concern to me, that private sector funding and volunteer utilization would ease the 40-percent cut in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. I totally disagree. Bridge has always, since 1970, utilized volunteers. In fact, we have over 150 professional volunteers with 29 paid staff at Bridge. So without the paid staff, there would be no Bridge. You cannot run an agency such as ours without qualified staff to plan, develop, and implement programs and to recruit, train, and supervise the volunteers.

Volunteerism is crucial to the success of our programs but the success of volunteerism is fully dependent on the role of paid staff who oversee all their activity.

There is also a great deal of discussion on the Federal level these days about private sector involvement. Bridge has also relied on a mix of funding for the agency, both public and private moneys. We have found that our public funding, especially the Federal runaway youth grant, has been invaluable in leveraging funds from the private sector. Competition for foundation and corporate funds is quite stiff these days. We need the current funding to leverage other sources. The runaway grant is 10 percent of our total budget. Our total Federal funding is 20 percent. State funding is 30. United Way and local organizations is 26. Foundations, corporations, interests and individual support is 24 percent. Take away one of those and the losers are the children and youth.

By investing in multifunded, multiservice programs, such as Bridge, through the Federal runaway and homeless youth grant, the Government is getting much more for its money than it does when it is the sole source of funds for a specific project. For runaway children and youth to lose services because we have done our job in attracting a mix of funds does not make too much sense.

Over the past 4 years Bridge has received an increase of $9,000 from the Federal runaway grant.

Senator **SPECTER**. What is the total that you receive, Sister?

Sister **WHELAN**. In 1982 we received $49,000.

Senator **SPECTER**. What is your total budget?

Sister **WHELAN**. Our total budget for last year was $525,000.

Senator **SPECTER**. So you do leverage very extensively, from $49,000 to $500,000.

Sister **WHELAN**. From the corporate foundations, to the city funding, to the parents of runaways, the first question we are asked is where do you get your funds and when we can say the United Way and Federal Government, it gives us more credibility to service the youngsters than anything else in the world.

Senator **SPECTER**. How much do you get from the United Way?

Sister **WHELAN**. We receive $75,000. This is our second year of funding.

Senator **SPECTER**. What is your evaluation of what you heard Mr. Dotson Rader say?

Sister **Whelan**. I just added at the bottom of my paper that I totally, thoroughly agree with him. What he is expressing to you is exactly what we deal with daily. We have 60 to 80 youngsters a day with all of the problems that were presented.

Senator **Specter**. How do you think we ought to tackle this problem? In what way can we get the problem solved, at the private level, public level?

Sister **Whelan**. No. I think that mixed funding is the answer. I think if we can continue to get support from all levels, from the Federal Government down to the private donation from an individual, that that is how we are going to continue to succeed. I have seen many programs in Boston go down the drain as a result of losing a one-time grant.

Senator **Specter**. But the suggestion is we need much, much more than we have now. How many times the existing facilities do we need to cope with this problem?

Sister **Whelan**. The statistics in Boston, since 1979, say we have about 3,000 runaways and I think we have about 42 beds in Boston for runaways.

Senator **Specter**. That is about 70 times as much or 80 times or 90 times.

[The prepared statement of Sister Whelan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SISTER BARBARA WHELAN

Bridge Over Troubled Waters began in 1970 as a street-based outreach program for runaways and homeless youth. Over the past 12 years, Bridge has become a comprehensive multi-service agency working with approximately 3,000 troubled children and youth each year. Since 1975, Bridge, in collaboration with Place Runaway House, has received a federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Program grant.

As a multi-service youth agency Bridge works with a total group of 14–21 year old runaways, throwaways, street youth, drug and alcohol abusers, high-school dropouts, prostitutes, gay hustlers, pregnant and parenting youth, formerly institutionalized youth, and delinquent young people with and without court involvement. The major focus is on 10–17 year old runaways and homeless youth. Bridge is located in downtown Boston, one block from the Boston Common, a major youth gathering place, and Park Street station, the central connecting point for the greater Boston subway system. Bridge streetworkers and the Free Medical Van tour the streets in several areas where youth gather.

Looking at the needs of the youth served by our federally-funded runaway program requires a look at the local and national social and economic climate. First, a look at decreases which result from the local Massachusetts tax initiative, Proposition 2½, the federal budget priorities, and the current recession: decreased school budgets; decreased extra-curricular school activities for regular and special need students; decreased availability of community mental health services; decreased summer youth employment opportunities; and decreased availability of residential facilities.

These decreases lead to a number of unfortunate increases: increased truancy; increased inactivity, depression and petty crime among youth; increased family tension and subsequent increased child abuse and family crises; increased drug and alcohol abuse among children and their parents; increased sexual victimization of youth in their families and on the streets; increased incidence of runaway activity; increased numbers of throwaway youth who have been pushed out of their homes unwillingly; increased numbers of runaway youth returning home without adequate community and family support systems leading to an increased rate of recidivism among runaways.

Bridge is a prevention program. We provide prevention, treatment and aftercare services to runaway and homeless youth who would otherwise be unreached until apprehended for criminal activity or referred to the courts on status offense charges. Local data, which is included as an attachment to this statement for your information, points to a filtering process in which youth who are not receiving prevention services, slide through the public law enforcement, juvenile justice and social service systems without receiving appropriate treatment. Some are weeded out after their initial arrest; others are referred by the courts to the Department of Social Services for residential placement in a system that is overloaded and minimally responsive; others simply slip through the cracks; and most end up back on the streets in a matter of time.

There is a great deal of discussion on the federal level these days about volunteerism. Bridge has always used volunteers in its program—in fact we have over 150 volunteers compared with 29 paid staff. Without the paid staff, two of whom are funded through the federal runaway grant, there would be no Bridge. You cannot run an agency such as ours without qualified staff to plan, develop and implement programs and to recruit, train and supervise volunteers. Volunteerism is crucial to the success of our program, but the success of volunteerism at Bridge is fully dependent on the role of paid coordinators who oversee all volunteer activity.

In our runaway program we have 2 staff people paid through the federal runaway grant and 18 volunteer shelter providers who are licensed by the state to house runaways in their homes. This program is cost-effective—but its effectiveness depends fully on the paid staff administering the program and providing the counseling and treatment services to the youth and families in crisis. With $49,000 in runaway grant funds last year, Bridge served 400 runaways. An additional 1,679 homeless and other vulnerable youth aged 10-17 also were helped by Bridge. The level of federal funding is clearly insufficient for the numbers of youth served and any reduction in funds would have serious implications for the continuation of Bridge's runaway program. This program provides a point of entry into other services offered at Bridge—GED preparation, career counseling, family life skills, free medical and dental care, job development and employment, and drug and alcohol counseling. Federal runaway funds open the door for many troubled youth to receive comprehensive services beyond those specifically funded by the grant. Were these runaway funds to be reduced or eliminated, the growing number of runaways who meet Bridge because they are runaways and because Bridge is a federally funded runaway center would go without the treatment they so desperately need.

There is also a great deal of discussion on the federal level these days about private sector involvement—private sector funding. Well, Bridge has always relied on a mix of funding for the agency—both public and private monies support Bridge. We have found that our public funding, especially the runaway youth grant, has been invaluable in leveraging funds from the private sector. Our federal runaway grant gives us credibility among potential private donors and has opened the door for us on many occasions. Competition for foundation and corporate funds is fierce these days and Bridge needs its current level of federal support to leverage other sources.

The runaway grant is 10 percent of Bridge's income. Our total federal funding is 20 percent of our income; state funding is 30 percent; United Way and local organizations is 26 percent; and foundations, corporations, trusts and individuals is 24 percent. Take away any one of these sources, and the losers are the children and youth. By investing in multi-funded, multi-service programs such as Bridge through the federal runaway and homeless youth grant, the government is getting much more for its money than it does when it is the sole source of funds for a specific project. For runaway children and youth to lose services because we have done our job and attracted a mix of funds does not make sense. The Runaway and Homeless Youth Program provides much needed assistance to a truly needy population and any reduction in current funding would be damaging to the nation's runaway youth programs and the clients we serve.

The private sector cannot do it all and it is ridiculous to assume that individuals, foundations, corporations and trusts (who in 1980 gave a combined total of 48 billion dollars in philanthropic contributions) will ever make up for the potential loss of 80 to 85 billion dollars the country is facing in federal government funding for human services.

I would like to tell you something about the real human beings that these facts and figures allude to:

Bridge met Jim in Boston's Combat Zone hustling for a living at age 15. We learned from him that he had left home after being sexually abused by a school bus driver and feeling like everyone knew. He talked about coming to Boston, scared and alone, being again sexually victimized on the streets, and deciding fairly quickly to hustle tricks for money. Jim is the middle child in a family of 5 children fathered by 3 different men. Never knowing for sure who his father was, he grew up felling unloved and unappreciated. Through Bridge's runaway program, Jim was placed in a foster home (he felt he could not return to his small home town) and is now getting extensive counseling which is helping him to sort out his life. He is off the streets, having had no involvement with the police or courts.

When Bridge met Leon he was 17. He had run away, was hanging out on the streets and heard about Bridge through other kids. He said he ran because his alcoholic mother and her alcoholic boyfriend were too much for him. He felt tired of being like his mother's parent, trying to protect her from her physically abusive boyfriend and from herself. He said he ran to fet some peace and because maybe without him around, his mother would learn to take care of herself. Bridge helped him set up his own independent living situation. He has a job now and is trying to make it on his own.

Ruth started working the streets as a prostitute while she still lived at home. Bridge met her at age 16, a pregnant runaway. She said she was tired of taking care of her alcoholic mother and her younger brothers and sisters. She had thought that a life on the streets would bring her independence and financial security. She hadn't counted on the victimization she encountered, and getting pregnant certainly frustrated her plans. Ruth came to Bridge's runaway program, got her GED through Bridge, participated in our Family Life Center for pregnant and parenting youth, and was an intake worker at Bridge during her pregnancy. Today she is off the streets, living independently with her child and continuing to come to Bridge for counseling.

In closing I would like to leave you with some statements that Bridge clients have made about Bridge:

When I called late at night, she came and got me and took me to this real super lady's house for the night. I was really scared and hungry and they fed me and were super nice to me. Then this morning she came back and talked to me for a long time and to my father and really helped us both.

Sometimes when I come in here I feel so good to be welcomed and wanted its like taking your first bike ride or the first time you catch a pass in football. They're the things you don't forget ever.

You can always come here. Everywhere else you have to make an appointment . . . and they're always too busy. Here at Bridge, they don't send you around from place to place. They take time with you here.

They can't hold my hand forever but the feeling of closeness I need sometimes is here and they give it to me when I need it.

LOCAL DATA PERTAINING TO RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH—GLEANED FROM THE 1980 U.S. CENSUS, BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT RECORDS, BOSTON JUVENILE COURT RECORDS AND MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES REPORTS

According to the 1980 U.S. Census there are 61,955 youth aged 10–17 residing in the city of Boston and 778,440 youth aged 10–17 residing in Massachusetts. Applying the 1975 Opinion Research Corporation runaway incidence of 1.7 percent to these figures would show 1,053 runaways for Boston and 13,224 for Massachusetts.

An on-going (since 1979) Boston Police Department estimate reports 3,000 homeless youth in Boston.

Boston Police data show a total of 3,396 juvenile arrests for youth under 18 in 1981.

Approximately 43 percent of the arrested juveniles, 1,446, appeared in Boston Juvenile Court on delinquency charges in 1981.

An additional 693 youth were in Boston Juvenile Court in 1981 as Children in Need of Services (CHINS)—a status (decriminalized) offense including runaways, truants and stubborn children.

118 of the CHINS cases were reported as "pure runaways." 45 were male, and 73 were female.

Annually the Massachusetts Department of Social Services has provided services to 3,500 CHINS cases statewide.

There are 6 youth shelters in the Boston area. none of which can respond to youth aged 17 and under unless they are referred by the courts or DSS (except for Place Runaway House which collaborates with Bridge under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program grant). 6 adult shelters exist to respond to the growing number of homeless adults in Boston—occasionally, but rarely, one of these adult facilities will shelter a youth.

The Mass. Department of Social Services maintains that the designations of runaway, truant or stubborn child are often arbitrary depending on who is filing the petition.

The Boston Juvenile Court confirms this assessment by DSS and reports that although only 118 of the 693 CHINS cases were reported as runaways, there is a strong likelihood of runaway behavior among the remaining CHINS cases.

[From the Boston Globe, May 23, 1982]

Ex-Dropouts Stand Proud for Diplomas

(By Richard Higgins)

There was the steady, half-step procession to the roll of "Pomp and Circumstance," the sea of blue-and-gold tassled mortarboards, the flashbulbs and flowers, the misty eyes and hugs, and all the things that a graduation should have.

Except an alma mater.

The 20 runaways, high school dropouts and former street kids who received their General Equivalency Diplomas (GED) at the Paulist Center on Park street Friday night were really graduating from The Bridge Over Troubled Waters, a sanctuary for homeless and wandering children in downtown Boston.

If crimson, pennants and striped tents were missing, however, there was more of the stuff of which real commencements are made. Every cap and gown told a story.

"All of us have come through some difficult time in which we needed help, but with self-determination and support from others, we are able to be here tonight," said Sonia Williams, 20, the valedictorian of sorts, one of seven GED graduates of the Bridge who have plans to go on to college.

Danny Morong, a one-time chronic truant, dropped out of school in the seventh grade and then left Revere after his parents were divorced. He made ends meet on the streets of Boston, "hanging out downtown." There were days and ways to get by he doesn't like to talk about much now.

About two years ago, some street workers from the Bridge introduced Danny to the center, and that, he says, is when "things started getting better for me." He began working there, studying for his GED, thinking about the future.

At last Friday's ceremonies, Danny, now 16, was chosen "most likely to succeed" hands down. In the fall, he will study criminal justice as a fulltime student at Bunker Hill Community College.

He says he'd like to be either a lawyer or a police officer, a line of work he has seen firsthand.

"If it wasn't for Bridge, I'd probably be in jail right now," he said at the Paulist Center auditorium, where parents, relatives and friends of the graduates adjusted carnations and posed each other for pictures. "They're good people [at the Bridge]. I think the big thing for me is that I didn't know at first if I could see this GED through to the end, and I did."

There was also Tina Zarella, 24, whose son, Peter, 6, and daughter Jennifer, 3, watched their mother graduate. A Brockton native who left school to be a mother and to work, she is the first member of her family to graduate from high school. "It feels pretty good," said Tina, nervous smiles tugging at the corners of her mouth. "If you want to do other stuff, you just got to get the diploma."

A good many of those receiving their diplomas were once street kids, victims of adults who prey on children but also the kind of juveniles who sometimes hustle tricks on Park Square or the Combat Zone, who drop out of sight, except when their needs overwhelm their means, the ones who sometimes land in the police lineups.

Or maybe they weren't the same ones, but many came from the same sub-culture of the street and that was what made the lineup to "Pomp and Circumstance" so different.

"Everybody puts these kids down, writes them off as just hopeless," said Brian Boggia, 27, who operates the Bridge medical van that cruises the city at night. "They see something like this and they say, 'can't understand how motivated and hard working they are.' It's all in the circumstances. Given half a chance, they can make something out of themselves. Everyone of them overcame some obstacle to be here tonight."

Twenty-eight earned their general equivalency diplomas through the Bridge this spring, certificates the state awards for passing a battery of tests comparable to those given graduating seniors in regular high schools. A study program is run by teachers at the Bridge, a multiservice center for runaways and other troubled young people located in a basement next to the Statehouse on Beacon Hill.

On Friday night, 20 of the GED graduates, ranging in age from 16 to 24, received their diplomas. "This is our high of the year," said Barbara Whalen, director of the 12-year-old center. "These are fabulous kids, and eager to learn. School itself wasn't the reason most dropped out. The reason they dropped out was largely family problems."

"Maybe the nicest thing about this is how it makes the kids feel about themselves," said Diane Goss, director of the GED program at the Bridge. "They're proud of themselves. They can say that they did this on their own, that they decided they wanted to do something, and they followed it through."

During the festivities, somebody leaned over and handed Susan Whitten, 17, of Brookline, a card. On the outside, it said, "At least you got something worthwhile out of school." And inside: "You."

Senator **SPECTER**. Let us turn to you, Ms. Tommie Lee Jones, director of the Youth-in-Action from Chester, Pa.

Nice to see you here. I understand that your facility has no public financing at all.

We would be pleased to hear about your experience and your operation.

STATEMENT OF TOMMIE LEE JONES

Ms. **JONES**. It is with pleasure that I present the following testimony on the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. As a director of a youth program, and through the years of our program's existence, Youth In Action, Inc. we have encountered numerous youth who had difficulty living at home, and thereby took flight by running away as a means of dealing with their dilemma. We have found the problems related to several factors, and our observation has been supported by experience to indicate professional help is extremely limited.

Unlike the other people I hear testifying this morning, we have been having trouble getting funds for the past 15 years. Chester is a city with a population of 49,000 people but we have very large problems and one of the problems are runaway youth or pushed away. Youth-in-Action was developed around the needs that the young people themselves in the community have identified for themselves which do not include guidelines or anything that had to do with the Federal Government, State, or local.

I think one of the problems has been that we do not focus on or recognize the problems that have been identified by youth that are facing them within their own communities. YIA has been functioning for the past 15 years with little or no money. At the present time we are at the verge of closing our doors with approximately 2,000 young people that we are working with; they are coming in each day as walk-ins.

Senator **SPECTER**. What is your total funding?

Ms. **JONES**. We have a total of $24,222 allocated from the department of—the commission on crime and delinquency and that is to work specifically with children that are having problems in courts.

Senator **SPECTER**. Is that a State agency?

Ms. **JONES**. Yes, it is.

Senator **SPECTER**. Is that your total budget, $24,000 a year?

Ms. **JONES**. That is right.

Senator **SPECTER**. How many people do you have working for your agency?

Ms. **JONES**. Right now we have three paid staff and a host of volunteers. I agree with the lady sitting next to me; we need professional staff, people that are paid staff.

Senator **SPECTER**. Three paid staff for a total not in excess of $24,000?

Ms. **JONES**. That is right.

Senator **SPECTER**. Not three well-paid staff.

Ms. **Jones**. No, indeed; of course not.

As director of a youth program, Youth-in-Action, located in Chester, Pa. I have encountered numerous youth that are leaving home. Most of these are not runaways. These are throwaways and have been kicked out. We have found the problem with running youth linked to several factors. Our observation has been supported by experience to indicate professional help is extremely limited.

What I mean by professional help, I am talking about institutions that are set up today primarily to care for these types of problems.

We have seen adolescents who are struggling with their own sense or need for indepencence against a society that says they are to be dependent until they reach the age of 18. We see these same youth become frustrated and angry because they do not have jobs or adequate training required for obtaining the needed financial resources to support their wishes. We also see youth who have difficulty accepting limits and structure from their parents, rejecting their parents' wishes. We often hear it said, if you don't like it, you can leave, or if you live in this house you have to live by my rules.

These are some of the things being threatened by parents today, especially during these economic crises. With the cost of living rising and all the stress of everyday living, kids are being thrown out of the house. I know that YIA has many young kids who are coming every day for the daily free lunches, which is the only meal they have for that day and are sleeping in abandoned homes.

We also see youth who are products, if not victims, of a problematic household. These are homes that are overwhelmed with the problems of living each day.

Getting back to youth that participate in prostitution, a lot of this is occurring in Chester because this is their only way of survival. We have seen young people whose parents have either died or suffered mental disorders and are unable to raise their children. These children are raised by relatives or some kind of care provided by an institution, there these children are being abused. I understand, to have a child put in care today would probably cost from $19,000 to $35,000 per year per child. YIA receives approximately $24,000 to run a program to service over 2,000 children. This does not seem right, especially since Youth-in-Action has a track record of success.

Surely one cannot imagine the kind of tragedy these children experience. Just to give you an example of one young lady who ran away from home, and then finally found in Baltimore—she had been picked up by three men. She had been repeated raped for 3 weeks and by the time she got to us for help we had to immediately put her in the hospital. At 14 years of age she had a complete hysterectomy.

One may develop the impression that this is our view, that all runaways are really nice kids who do not have problems themselves but are victims of either someone else's problem, like their parents for example or are trying to adjust to some biological functioning of the body.

The treatment of young people who tend to run away has been an area of concern. First of all, when a young person takes flight, he is usually desperate, frustrated, perhaps angry, and therefore, takes flight as a last act of desperation. Unfortunately, traditional child welfare and counseling programs have what appears to be a hit and miss approach. What I mean by this is that there are very limited services being provided for children through these child welfare agencies. You may sit at your desk and converse with someone at home about their problems but unless you go there visibly and see what their situation actually is, to find out what actually can be done, you cannot help.

During the treatment process it appears to be a struggle between the helping agent, the family and the youth regarding loyalties. Helping agents tend to give lip service toward supporting the youth but tend to identify with the parent and vice versa. In other words, when the social worker, supposedly a friend of the youth, goes into the home, when they are meeting with the parents and the youth, they have a tendency to turn against the youth and thereby the child loses confidence and trust in their social worker. Obviously the child will tend to protect the parents.

By the way, you mentioned not having young people testify. I had tried very hard to bring along with me today several young people. But for protection of the parent, regardless of what the situation is, they will protect their parents and in doing so they feel if they would come down——

Senator SPECTER. You were unable to find them?

Ms. JONES. I was not unable to find them. I was unable to get the commitment.

Senator SPECTER. The parents are willing to kick them out of the house but not as far as a Senate hearing.

We have your statement. It is very helpful.

Let me ask you one final question. What is your best recommendation as to how this problem should be dealt with?

Ms. JONES. I, too, agree with the rest of the panel. I think that more moneys should be allocated for runaway shelters and for services that are provided with the communities. I feel that people living with their problems know what their problems are and there is no need to spend billions and billions of dollars in research in studying what is being done. We know what the problem is, regardless of whether it is in the urban community, ghettos, or middle class, or rich. The problem is very, very visible.

The point about the block grant moneys, I see that we have not benefited from it; I do not know about other community organizations. I think that guidelines should be more direct as to how the money is to be spent and I also think there should be more freedom of speech as to how the money is to be spent within the community for their own needs.

Before I close with my testimony here today I would like to say that I am a Republican and a committee woman in Chester. I represent the 7th ward second precinct. The problems in my community is no more simple than resolving the political issue between the PLO and Israel. The same level of negotiating is involved and needed. Just as negative results of the issues between the PLO and Israel would have a profound effect on the residents involved, the same, again, could be said of the negative results from negotiations between these parties. Both situations are equivalent to armed camp fighting to preserve their turf.

Federal funding has to reflect and encompass this concept. A further reduction in funds for these types of services could result in the impossibility to provide even a piecemeal service. Needless to say, this would be more tragic acting out, though running away, would increase, and the youth will be convinced they have no alternative. Their lives would be increasingly in danger and an increase in deaths among runaways can be expected. They, the young people will risk death and other dangers because they will believe they have no other choice. Surely society, with all of its abundance and resources will have failed a significant segment.

Also I would like to add that more funds should be available to grassroot community-based organizations such as Youth In Action.

It is high time that we stop some of these traditional organizations from wasting money on hiring people to run programs that are truly not effective.

As I mentioned earlier in my testimony, Youth In Action is on the verge of closing its doors to approximately 2,000 young people who are in desparate need of our services. Therefore, it is my opinion that a community committee group be formed among people who have experienced the problem of running away or was the parent of a runaway. After all, they should be able to decide the fate of their destiny.

As such, a program was formed entitled "Scared Straight" to scare youth away from a life of crime, such a group as this in which I am speaking could possibly scare youth away from running away. And this committee group will be there to assist any youth or parent who is experiencing this situation.

This will serve as a temporary shelter for the troubled youth experiencing that problem of wanting to run away from home. It is a shame to say that we had animal shelters before we had shelters for human life.

And in answer to your question Senator Specter about the situation between black and white in the city of Chester, it is depressing to say that there is a problem with racism, but now days there is no place in the world where you can go and say that you live freely without racism. During these economic crises, the whites are fighting the blacks to get whatever they want or need in order to survive and visa versa. And since Chester is the first depressed city in the Nation, we do have a slight problem with racism.

But we can overcome all of our existing problems no matter what they are if the people would just learn to work together.

Before I end I would just like to let the Senate Judiciary Committee know that they are welcome to visit Youth In Action at any time.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Jones follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TOMMIE LEE JONES

It is with pleasure that I present the following testimony on the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. As a Director of a youth program, Youth In Action, Inc., I have encountered numerous youth who had difficulty living at home, and took flight as a means of dealing with their dilemma. We have found the problems related to several factors; our observation has been supported by experience to indicate professional help is extremely limited.

We have seen adolescents who were struggling with their own sense or need for independence against a society that ways they are to be dependent until they reach the age of eighteen. We see these same youths become frustrated and angry because they do not have jobs or adequate training required for obtaining the needed financial resources to support their wish, if not demand, for independence. We also see youth who have difficulty accepting limits and structure from their parents, rejecting their parent's wishes. "If you live in this house, you will do as I say." That kind of rule is an open invitation for them to take flight. We also see youth who are products, if not victims, of a problematic household. Unfortunately these youth feel less important, as they are lost in the parent's struggle. We have seen young people whose parents have either died or suffered mental illnesses and are unable to raise them. The children are then raised by relatives or other care providers who sometimes fail to have the needed understanding and compassion for raising children. Many of the young people we have seen are "love starved." Therefore, they take flight to find love and acceptance, to find work in order to become financially independent, and generally to find a "better world."

Surely one cannot imagine the kind of tragedies these children often find. One may develop the impression that it is our view that all runaways are really "nice" kids who don't have problems themselves, but are victims of either someone else's problem, or are trying to adjust to some new biological functioning of the body. While this impression is largely accurate, there are some young people who runaway who have more severe personality problems, if not mental disorders.

The treatment of young people who tend to runaway has been an area of concern. First of all, when a young person takes flight, he is usually desperate, frustrated, perhaps angry, and therefore, takes flight as a last act of desperation. Unfortunately traditional child welfare and counseling programs have what appears to be a "hit and miss" approach to responding to the needs of the young. Traditional child welfare to recognize the value of developing a positive relationship with the young as a base of beginning treatment. During the treatment process, it appears to be a struggle between the helping agent, the family and the youth regarding loyalties. Helping agents tend to give "lip service" toward supporting the youth but tend to identify with the parent and vica versa. Obviously, the need is to develop a treatment process so that there is not the misfortune of falling into a trap of identifying with either protagonist. It almost seems as though the helping agent must walk a tight rope between all parties, and such is actually the case. The "trap" is easy to fall into, on the part of helping agents, because of the time factor----if not cost. Because of limited monies and personnel, agencies are not able to provide adequate treatment. They, at best, are only able to use a band-aid approach, and try to calm down the emergencies. The best treatment that would have a lasting effect would follow the crisis or emergency stage, and unfortunately, because of the large number of cases, the agencies are not able to remain consistently involved with a client to provide the total and complete service that is warranted. The result is that youth and their families are given piece-meal services for very serious problems. The problems involving runaways are usually very serious, even though they are often viewed as negative, rebellious, sexually active teenagers who are spoiled and need their backside spanked. Actually they are suffering from serious emotional disturbances that have significant and profound implications for their future lives. However, if runaways are able to successfully get through this experience, they may become more wholesome and productive young adults, capable of making a great contribution to our society.

I urge that this committee respond to runaways as a serious situation, and not to be taken lightly. This committee can urge that adequate funds are provided to persons experiencing this difficulty are given full and complete services. This may convey the message to our young population that they are valued, and we do see them as capable, contributing citizens. By giving them limited or no services, we say to them we do not value you and you are a less important priority in our society.

The most pressing need is for helping agents to acquire sufficient funds to hire adequate and full staffs. The staff will be expected to meet consistently with the troubled youth, and his family both individually and collectively in order to gain a full understanding of the problem the youth is experiencing. The biggest challenge may be convincing the youth that someone really cares about him and is interested in helping him resolve his dilemmas. Secondly, the next phase involves hearing the parents or caretakers express their dissations or wishes, and develop a mode of communication between both parties. This may appear to be a simple task, however it is not. It is no more simple then resolving the political issue between the PLO and Israel. The same level of negotiating is involved and needed. Just as negative results of the issues between the PLO and Israel would have a profound effect on the residents involved, the same, could be said from negotiations between these parties. Both parties are equivalent to "armed camps" fighting to preserve their turf.

Federal funding has to reflect and emcompass this concept. A further reduction in funds for these types of services could result in the impossibility to provide even a piece meal service. Needless to say, this would be more tragic. Acting out, through running away, would increase, and the youth will be convinced they have no alternative. Their lives would be increasingly in danger and an increase in deaths among runaway can be expected. The young people will risk death and other dangers, because they will believe they have no other choice. Surely society, with all of its abundance and resources, will have failed a significant segment of the population.

Those of us in our positions must accept the obligations of conveying our impresssions and recommendations to those of you in your positions of authority. We must represent those members of our society who are not in a position to fully represent themselves. These young folks should not be victimized or penalized further because they are not of the age to vote. You are urged to accept your obligation and advocate further on their behalf, and make certain sufficient funds are allocated to provide full and complete services to these troubled youngsters and their families. Troubled youth are a flaw to our affluent society. We must contimue to preserve our youth and see them as our leaders of tomorrow. We must fully prepare them for that role. This is your opportunity to do so. I urge you, on behalf of these troubled and disadvantaged young people, not to drop the ball, and to act sensitively and responsibly

Thank You

Senator **Specter**. Thank you very much, Ms. Jones. We very much appreciate your testimony.

Now I would like to turn to Mr. Arnold Sherman, executive director of the Youth Network Council in Chicago who I am told has extensive experience, not only with Chicago, Ill., but also with nationwide efforts on this problem.

We welcome you here and your very helpful testimony will be made a part of the record. We would like you to summarize it, leaving the maximum amount of time for questions.

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD E. SHERMAN

Mr. **Sherman**. I am here on behalf of the National Youth Network Alliance which represents most runaway youth programs such as my own program in Chicago which serves roughly 3,000 runaway young people a year.

Senator **Specter**. Could you give us a little synopsis of your background, experience, and education?

Mr. **Sherman**. I have been in the youth field since 1970, primarily working with delinquents, runaways, troubled young people. I have operated a comprehensive youth service program in the State of Ohio. I have worked in Washington at the National Youth Network Alliance as Deputy Director, and since 1977 I have been executive director of the Youth Network Council in Chicago, which is a coalition of 135 youth programs serving the Chicago area. We operate a statewide organization as well, the Illinois Collaboration on Youth, which is concerned with challenging policy and practice at the State level and working on State youth service reform.

What I would like to share with the committee today is the kinds of kids our program is currently seeing and I believe, in light of everything you have heard this morning, so eloquently summarized by Dotson Rader's testimony, why it is critically important to see that the Runaway Youth Act receives its full $25 million authorization.

Again, I will not summarize or go into the details of the horror stories. We see our share in Chicago. The kinds of things you have heard this morning we see in Chicago every day. Kids who are vulnerable, being preyed upon, involved on the streets in prostitution, drug use and abuse, kids contemplating suicide. We have kids who have sold their bodies for soft drinks and sold their bodies at truck stops in order to get out of town.

I would like to give you a typical story of the kind of kid we see every day. We had a 14-year-old boy that showed up in our program, at Aunt Martha's Youth Center, one of our sites in Chicago. He had run away from home from Michigan. His father had been employed by Ford Motor Co. for 14 years and had been laid off. His father had been out of work in excess of 1 year, had lost all of his benefits, all of his unemployment. They were forced to sell their home and move into a small apartment in another community. The father began to drink, had marital problems. They were taking it out on the young boy. He was having difficulty adjusting. He split. He showed up in Chicago. We contacted the family. They were glad he was in a safe haven. They wanted his return. After some counseling he wanted to return. The family did not even have money to pay for gas. We had to take him to the bus station to send him back. That is the kind of kid we are seeing. We are seeing those kids not only in light of the Federal cutbacks, but in my home State of Illinois, because of other losses of funds, because of the loss of the youth employment funds, the LEAA maintenance of efforts funds OJJDP funds et cetera, we have seen a 28-percent cutback in resources for community youth agencies this year.

Senator SPECTER. What level of funding is necessary, in your judgment?

Mr. SHERMAN. The full authorization of $25 million would just begin to scratch the surface of the kind of comprehensive programs that are critically needed.

Senator SPECTER. And what would deal adequately with the kind of comprehensive programs you feel are needed?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think a proliferation of programs. The number of centers currently funded are inadequate. Expansion of services, adding supplemental programs, for example, family treatment, self-sufficiency skill development, beginning to provide young people with positive alternatives to the difficult life experiences that they are facing.

I think an additional point that is often overlooked with just a money discussion is not just the service program element but the Runaway Youth Act has been an impetus in many States for legislative reform.

There was a question early about sanctions for parents of throwaway children and whether there was any legislation to deal with that. This year in Illinois, primarily through our leadership and because we had a runaway youth program and were able to educate our legislature to the kinds of problems young runaways were experiencing, we passed a bill which would allow us to bring parents into court if they refused to let young people come back into their home. There is now a specific action to bring families, not just the young person who is most often a victim, but bring the parents in before a judge.

With a proliferation of programs, what you will also see is, besides a comprehensive network of programs, you will see greater public attention focused on the problems associated with runaway behavior. As there are more and more people aware of what is going on and what needs to be done, positive change will occur.

Senator SPECTER. Do you have any suggestion as to how to proceed to get that greater level of public funding?

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I think public pressure—I think Dotson Rader's article will help a great deal. I think a campaign similar to those used for child abuse and antismoking would help. I think the public, when apprized of the situation—for example, in Chicago, when we get the media attention that is appropriate, as we have done the "Donohue" show and others, we have seen tremendous public support and appreciation. We have seen bipartisan legislative support. Right now we have passed a bill that is sitting on the Governor's desk and will be signed, which will remove majority of runaways from court jurisdiction and make it a community and family responsibility to deal with the problem.

Senator SPECTER. What success have you had in getting extra funding from the Illinois legislature?

Mr. **Sherman**. The Department of Children and Family Services have allocated $2 million to fund a network of 30 front-end prevention programs that will serve runaway youth as well as provide other crisis intervention resources. That is a first step and we are looking to push it beyond that.

Senator **Specter**. What will the impact of the 40-percent cut of funds on Chicago be?

Mr. **Sherman**. It will be devastating. We have not seen a real increase for the RYA program since its inception. The only reason our program can provide the kind of service we do is we have 80 volunteers, parents who, without being paid, are housing runaway youth for up to 15 days. But we need to maintain a core professional staff. The 3,000 kids that we see are far short of the 40,000 runaways in need that are reported every year in the city of Chicago alone.

Senator **Specter**. Picking up on the suggestion of Detective Robertson, do you see any utility for some sort of centralized recordkeeping that may be maintained by the FBI on runaways?

Mr. **Sherman**. Not only runaways but missing children as well. It is a very difficult and serious problem. Our personal experience with the *Gasey* case a few years back showed there was no information coordination. We have 125 different police jurisdictions in Cook County and none of them share any information with each other. We need coordination not only on a local level but on a national level. There needs to be a central point where all that information is shared and disseminated.

Senator **Specter**. We have such legislation which is now pending. It has gone through our subcommittee and it is now at the full committee level and we hope to have some action on that.

Anything you care to add beyond what you have testified?

Mr. **Sherman**. I think the key issue is that Youth Runaway Act grantees, primarily due to lots of other cutbacks, are the last remaining visible national structure for crisis service to the young. They have been the mental health services of the 1980's for youth. The kinds of kids we get are abused, are exploited, are status offenders who are diverted from more costly and often inappropriate institutionalization. If we have a conscience as a people then we should be looking to this kind of a program receiving a substantial funding increase and seeing it as a substantial investment in our youth rather than thinking of cutting it back or eliminating it.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Sherman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ARNOLD E. SHERMAN

I appreciate the opportunity extended to me by Senator Specter to appear before the Subcommittee today and share my views on the implementatation of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act

The youth organizations that I direct, the Youth Network Council of Chicago and the Illinois Collaboration on Youth, represent over 135 community organizations serving in excess of 125,000 youth and families, yearly, throughout Illinois.

I have worked with runaway youth and their families for more than 10 years. The Youth Network Council operates the largest Youth Development Bureau funded runaway project, which this year will serve 2,900 youth, including 400 out-of-state-youth, and their families. Our first hand, daily, contact with these young people is a constant reminder of the importance and necessity of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act has provided more than a safe haven for youth absent from home.
The RHYA:

a) Serves as a crisis intervention anchor for youth and families in local communities.
b) Provides immediate, accessible and client acceptible services to youth and families in crisis.
c) Grantee projects, in many communities, have become the Mental Health Centers of the 1980's.
d) Has drawn public attention to and action on such related issues as;
    * child and adolescent abuse
    * incest
    * child pornography
    * sexual abuse

- teen prostitution
- missing children

e) Has aided in the identification of local service delivery gaps.

f) Has been an impetus for legislative reform in many states, restraining and avoiding the formerly common and inappropriate practice of institutionalization of status offenders and youth involved in non-criminal misbehavior.

The RHYA has been a strong supporter of augmenting core program services with volunteer involvement, making these programs extremely cost efficient. For example, the Temporary Housing Project that the Youth Network Council operates, could only serve 2,900 youth and families on $200,000 in Federal support because over 80 voluntary, unpaid, licensed foster parents provide housing services.

The RHYA has contributed to keeping government, in the form of the juvenile court and child welfare system, out of family focused problems.

In Illinois, we are currently passing legislation to remove status offenders from court jurisdiction, in most instances, while simultaneously creating a statewide network of comprehensive and integrated crisis intervention resources. Our effective work with runaway youth, these past seven years, was a major legislative selling point in this sweeping reform of Illinois' youth service system.

The operation of the program is not without its problems. RHYA grantees continue to struggle with:

a) antiquated state and local licensing practices and requirements.

b) year to year funding uncertainty
c) lack of necessary supportive and complimentary community resources.
d) police, juvenile court and child welfare bureaucracies.

Specifically, I would like to comment on the key issues facing the continued successful operation of our National Runaway Program.

I. Funding

Due to the loss of over $100 million in Federal Juvenile Justice funds and programs, tne need for a full $25 million appropriation for the RHYA is critical. RHYA grantees are now the major prevention and family reunification resource nationwide. Any reduction of funds from the current $11 million level would be devastating to the already fragile "front-end" intervention services that still only reaching 6% of the target population.

My current experience with dozens of corporate and foundation philanthropies assures me that the potential support for runaway services is negligible. Historically, private philanthropy shys away from ongoing program operational support. Youth services has never received particularly high priority, and the current major are of a philanthropy interest for youth, understandably, is youth employment.

Infusion of State and local government funds is unlikely, due to the overall tension placed on social services funding by the massive federal cutbacks. Already the politics of competing priorities have inflicted its toll on youth services. A survey we conducted this year in Illinois showed a 28% reduction in funds necessary to maintain last years service delivery levels by youth agencies.

Those State and local funds, that might be available, are sure to come with pressure to serve priority clients of the particular funding source, tending to bastardize runaway service programs, undermind project integrity and diverting resources from intended service recipients,

Volunteers are essential to augment trained youthworkers but not as replacements. Volunteers provide valuable, practical project assistance as:

a) Foster Parents
b) Tutors
c) Board Members
d) Recreational Aides
e) Special Event Fund Raisers

They cannot substitute for "hard services" delivery due to:

a) sensitive intervention necessary to achieve family reunification
b) turnover
c) reliability
d) commitment fluxation
e) scheduling and availability

It is clear that a full $25 million appropriate is the kind of investment that pays off in decreased penetration of young people into the more costly and often inappropriate child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Its dividends, in human terms, are the numbers of youth successfully reunited with their families and protected from exploitation and victimization on the streets.

II. Relationship Between Grantee and Federal Government

The RHYA, as a small catagorical program administered by the Youth Development Bureau, has had its operational advantages and drawbacks.

The paperwork and bureaucractic requirements of administering the program from the grantee perspective has been minimal. With Caroline Croft, as Runaway Director in Washington and Katie Williams, as Region V Liaison we have enjoyed good communication and strong program interest. While the "smallness" of the national program has been helpful on a daily operational basis, it has been a hinderance for longer term issues. The Youth Development Bureau has been able to do little in developing a coherent national youth policy. There continues to be virtually no substantive coordination among federal youth related programs.

From the grantee perspective, there is a need to develop and promote a National Youth Policy that encompasses and builds upon existing youth service programs.

A Policy that demands coordination of categorical initiatives into comprehensive service delivery strategies. A Policy that intimately involves service providers and young people themselves in the process that will shape the development of a newly reorganized federal approach to services for youth.

Contracted technical assistance resources have often been irrelevant and of little practical value to mature, established programs, in need of more sophisticated support and guidance.

Conflicting Federal and State policies regarding such fundamental issues as confidentiality, parental consent, interstate compact, and legal liability have never been adequately resolved.

The Youth Development Bureau through its guidelines, policies, and program performance standards has promoted a singular style of service delivery, the runaway shelter, almost without exception. Our project in Chicago, being one exception, uses a decentralized network of nine crisis intervention agencies backed up by voluntary foster homes to provide immediate intervention services to youth and families. This has resulted in less housing service reliance and shorter term placements. Of 2,900 youth served this year, less than 25% will be housed. The Youth Development Bureau should be encouraged to investigate and support alternative methods of serving runaway and homeless youth.

III. Most Pressing Youth and Family Needs

By serving runaway and homeless youth, youthwork agencies have gained symptomatic access into the complicated world of adolescent development. A world in 1982, where running away from home is often considered a healthy, responsible alternative to an overwhelming life situation. The opportunity afforded by this unique access to youth and families in crisis has never been fully utilized. Many youth will return home and continue on without the necessity of further public intervention or reliance. For a significant minority, however, resources beyond band-aid, short term attention is required, and most often not readily available.

The most commonly identified service needs that should be available but usually are lacking include:

1) longer term family therapy services
2) independent living programs
3) employment generating and assistance programs
4) intermediate residential care placement
5) self-sufficiency training and support resources
6) remedial, alternative and vocational education services
7) alternative living option

Senator **Specter**. Thank you very much, Mr. Sherman.

Thank you, Sister Whelan, Ms. Jones, Mr. Sherman. We very much appreciate you being here.

This is a problem which this subcommittee will continue to address and we shall maintain the efforts that we have about the funding issue and the testimony which has been highlighted here today will be very helpful in presentation to the full subcommittee, the full committee, to the Senate and the Congress.

Thank you all very much.

[Whereupon, at 11:13 a.m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

Testimony of Herb Lawrence
Coordinator, The Youth Services Alliance of Pennsylvania
before the United States Senate
Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice
Oversite Hearing on
The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act
Title III of The Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

Mr. Chairman and members of the Sub-committee, I am Herb Lawrence, Coordinator of the Youth Services Alliance of Pennsylvania (YSAP). It is a pleasure to represent our organization and to provide comments concerning the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

The Youth Services Alliance of Pennsylvania is a five year old, private non-profit, membership organization of over 55 small, non-secure, community based service providers and developers serving approximately 12,000 young people and their families annually across the Commonwealth. About ½ of our members were operating prior to the passage of Pennsylvania's Act 41 in 1977 and about ½ of the programs were organized as a consequence of this legislation which deinstitutionalized "status offenders" and brought our state into compliance with the federal statute. Members operate programs such as youth service bureaus, group homes, runaway programs, day treatment programs, alternative schools, drug and alcohol programs and other prevention and diversion programs. Several youth service planning bodies and County Children and Youth agencies are also members. Also among our members are five of the seven federally funded runaway youth programs in our state. Applications for membership from the two newer programs, currently entering their second year of funding under the RHYA, are anticipated. Formed in concert with the passage and implementation of our state deinstitutionalization statutes, the Alliance has consistently acted in support of the intent of that legislation by attempting to make community based alternatives available and accessable for dependent and delinquent children, youth and families in the least possible restrictive settings.

In its efforts to accomplish this, YSAP has supported, participated in and sponsored training, technical assistance and conferences designed to enhance programs capabilities to provide appropriate and effective services as well as endeavored to educate other providers, provider organizations, policy makers and government officials regarding the scope, effectiveness, cost-efficiency and logic of community base services not only as alternatives to institutionalization, but also as first line services necessary to prevent and divert youth from becomming involved with the child welfare or juvenile justice systems.

These efforts have included the compiling and dissemination of information regarding programming, legislation, policy, regulations and available training through publications and alerts, the establishment of statewide Training Co-operative, the planning and execution of four statewide membership conferences and several smaller single day events. Most recently, with the aid of a grant from RHYA networking initiative monies, the Alliance has openned a small Harrisburg office to expand and continue these activities. Over the last five years, YSAP members have grown from their participation, cooperation and collaboration with member programs and other provider systems. These programs comprise a viable, statewide network of responsive, effective and legitimate non-secure alternatives to public providers systems, institutions and secure detention.

In spite of consistent federal support of Pennsylvania programs for runaway and homeless youth, the future of this network and of the programs that comprise it is now, increaseingly, in jeopardy. With the deinistitutionalization of status offenders in 1977, community based services within Pennsylvania experienced a boom period marked by increases in funding, increased attention to the needs of youth in communities, active governmental support for responsive programming and an increased belief that needs could be met in home communities. Adolescent services, especially for the non-delinquent status offender, exhibited the most substantial growth. Organizations which had previously struggled for survival had achieved stability.

Then in FY 80/81 programs for dependent children, youth and families sustained a 30% cut in state funds resulting in returns to baseline budgets, reductions in staff and, in some cases, program closing. Together with increased caseloads, mandates to work with youth formerly served by juvenile court and probation systems and Department of Public Welfare priorities and goals stressing family maintenance, reunification and in home services, YSAP member agencies largely chose to cut administrative staff positions and travel, training and staff development budget items in efforts to continue to meet the needs of youth and families in their communities.

These situations have been extended by the actual FY 81/82 and the proposed 82/83 reductions in federal dollars and by the reorganization of available monies into block grants to states. Not only were programs operating funds further reduced, but the general availability of social services was also drastically restricted. With an alarming national economic picture and a hesitancy on the part of state government caused by uncertainty as to the dollar amounts of federal funds and the manner in which they were to be delivered, YSAP members are again confronted with increased caseloads, further staff shortages, uncertain future funding and limited to non-existent opportunities for training, technical assistance as well as emotional support for their continuing efforts.

Also in the course of the last year, state legislation has been introduced that threatens to negate many of the gains made in the availability and accessability early intervention and diversion services and ignors the effective application of those services in many communities.

Finally, the state has embarked on a series of activities that will culminate in coordinated human service planning in counties. While the potential of improved, coordinated service and fiscal savings is inherent in the intent of this plan, so is the reality of increased competition among providers for available funds. Small, non-profit, community based providers are currently ill equipped to compete as equal partners with larger, more established provider systems including public children and youth agencies and juvenile court systems.

In this context, I wish to discuss several issues that are crucial to our state's capacity to provide effective, non-secure, community based services to runaway, homeless and ejected youth.

While many thousand youth and their families have benefited from Pennsylvania's runaway youth programs, funding has not been sufficient to meet existing need for these services, to expand those services to other communities, and to educate the state's General Assembly, state and local governments and the general public as to the need for state and local support for these services and programs.

In the spring of this year, YSAP began to compile data and program information from RHYA funded programs. We are currently in the process of utilizing that information to support the expanded funding of programs of federal, state and local levels. Although data on runaway and homeless youth are not compiled in our state, conservative estimates based on national statistics and state police reports of runaways and homeless youth who commit delinquent acts suggest that in excess of 45,000 young people were out of their homes and on the streets in Pennsylvania last year.

Of those youth, an overview of service by the seven programs currently receiving RHYA funding documents that in 1981:

- Shelter and counseling services were provided to 2190 runaway, homeless or ejected youth and their families;
- 1300 youth received one-time drop in services;
- Another 6130 young people received assistance through programs' 24 hour emergency telephone services;
- 61% of these youth were female and 39% male;
- The average age of youth seen in programs were under 15 years old;
- Over 88% of youth seen lived in the county where the program was located;
- The single largest referral source were the youth and families themselves (over 40%) with the rest of referrals coming from law enforcement officials, schools, the juvenile justice system and other social service agencies; and
- Approximately 70% of youth served returned to their families or to relatives.

Of the estimated 45,000 runaway, homeless and ejected youth in our Commonwealth, only 9620 (21%) had contact with programs specifically tailored to their problems and needs; and only 2190 youth and their families (5%) receive the full benefit of those services. An overwhelming number of out-of-home youth seek services within their own communities and, where those services are available, the vast majority of youth and their families come to a resolution of their problems with assistance. By doing so, young people are diverted from involvement in prostitution, juvenile crime, and suicide as well as from the costly juvenile justice and child welfare systems.

Services for runaway, homeless and ejected youth and their families are too few, remain underfunded are are largely understaffed in Pennsylvania. Efforts to improve public policies on behalf of these youth and to sustain community programs that have proven to be effective and cost-efficient responses to their needs continue to be threatened on many fronts. Fiscal pressures on agencies limit the number of youth and families that can be served and, in some cases, threaten the existance of the programs themselves. In Pennsylvania, as in other states, public pressure is portending a return to more punitive and restrictive juvenile justice practices that have proven both ineffective and much more costly than community programs designed for these young people and their families.

Continued and expanded federal support of these programs and supportive activities is needed to:

* expand and strengthen the programmatic response in proportion to the needs of the population of runaway, homeless and ejected youth in our state;

* support current efforts to educate state officials, government leaders and the public as to the need for state and local funds to expand these services;

* develop and implement YSAP's efforts to transfer the technology and knowledge gained by currently funded programs to other agencies and groups wishing to initiate programs for runaway and homeless youth; and to

* support coordinated national efforts such as training and technical assistance to programs, the Youth Services Institutes, and data collection and analysis to better understand and meet the needs of these youth and their families.

We urge the Subcommittee to support increased funding to a level equal to the authorized $25 million level. Failure to do so will effectively support regressive efforts in Pennsylvania that may well result in the reinstitutionalization of these dependent youth which will preclude their receiving the services necessary to address the underlying causes and conditions which prompted their voluntary or involuntary leaving their homes.

Second, throughout the course of funding for runaway and homeless youth programs, the Youth Development Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has made substantial efforts to assist programs to maximize the potential of their services through the provision of training and technical assistance, program monotering and evaluation, and by the collection and analysis of data. These critical and supportive services, provided over the years both directly by YDB or through contracts with several fine consulting and training firms, have been in increasing jeopardy over the last few years. The training and technical assistance provided through YDB has been vital to the continued success and growth of programs, has provided support in programs' efforts to build and develop linkages in their communities and states, and has constructively helped programs identify and adapt to the changing needs of the youth and families they serve. If funding of the national RHYA program is maintained at current levels, the training and technical assistance available to programs will become increasingly insufficient and inadequate.

In addition to individual programatic support and assistance, continued support for the Youth Services Institute and the Networking Initiative should be sustained and expanded. Both of these efforts have proven to be effective and cost efficient mechanisms to further build, support and expand quality services to runaway and homeless youth. In Pennsylvania, the Youth Services Alliance, with the aid of a networking grant, has begun to be able to effectively work with the state government, the legislature, citizens groups and member and non-member programs to enhance the acceptance of services, to promote the growth and development of those services and to increase the exchange of information, skills and resources among member agencies, other providers, state and local government and the general public. The Alliance however, needs continued support and funding if it is to secure current inroads and if it is to assure continued high quality services for runaway and homeless youth and their families in the Commonwealth. This year, the support and assistance of the National Conference of State Legistures through their arrangement with YDB has been especially valuable to our work within the Alliance.

Just as the Networking Initiative has supported information and technology transfer within out state, the Youth Services Institute provides a forum for the exchange of information and development of technology among states and regions. Because individual program funds are so severely restricted and because our state's support of non-restrictive, community based services has been reduced, the availability of opportunities such as the YSI is crucial to programatic development, resource exchange and training. Without these opportunities the gains made by programs over the years may be lost and the future growth of those programs will be at risk.

Finally, the Youth Services Alliance is concerned that an appropriation at or below current levels will undercut the gains made in Pennsylvania to fully implement and sustain the deinstitutionalization of "status offenders". In many respects, Pennsylvania programs receiving RHYA monies have been the leaders in our state both in support of the concept and practice of deinstitutionalization and, even more importantly, in the development of model programs which demonstrate that the provision of effective, cost efficient services result in improved individual and family functioning, reduced levels of placement, and in the prevention of delinquency and exploitation of youth who, without these programs, would be left to the streets. Other Pennsylvania service providers, both public and private, need the benefit of continued contact with these proven and established programs to replicate them in other Pennsylvania communities. The leadership of these established programs is especially vital in the light of proposed state legislation that would, once again, subject dependent youth to secure detention.

In conclusion, YSAP would like to thank the Congress and recognize the Youth Development Bureau, the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services and the National Youth Work Alliance for their support and work throughout the course of funding of the National Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. All of us in the business of serving children, youth and families have not only benefited from this initiative, but have also found it to have had a creative, forward looking impact on ourselves as professionals and on the programs and agencies in which we work. In addition to the obvious benefits that consumers have received through these programs, the contribution these programs have made to the advancement of our profession has been both extensive and valuable. The YSAP strongly urges the Subcommittee to support an increased appropriation for these programs and other supportive activities to the authorized $25 million level.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this information and comments to the Subcommittee.

Testimony of W. Douglas McCoard
Before The Senate Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
Senator Arlen Specter, Chairman

My name is (Rev.) W. Douglas McCoard and I have been Executive Director of Huckleberry House, Inc., in Columbus, Ohio, for almost twelve years. I also serve on the Board of the Ohio Youth Services Network, the National Youth Work Alliance, and the State of Ohio Juvenile Justice (H.B. 440) Oversight Committee. I appreciate this opportunity to review some of the activities as a result of the Runaway Youth Act. I would like to express my appreciation to the Senators on the Juvenile Justice Committee and their staff for their leadership, vision and courage on behalf of youth. The needs of adolescent young people and their families often are not considered as priority by many, so I know your efforts are motivated by a vision and concern for the future of our youth and not by limited short sighted-opportunism.

I will first highlight program service issues and implications, and conclude with some policy considerations.

The nature of adolescence puts a youth in limbo between childhood and adulthood. It is a time when frequently those around the youth no longer see the growing, developing person as someone with problems, but as the problem.

Young people require more effort to become successfully engaged in service programs. Because adolescents are in transition, they are frequently not considered appropriate for family therapy, yet many are said to be too old for "preventative" individual work. Adults are often impatient and do not want to treat youth as if they were "almost adults", having a right to know what is happening to them and having a right to help decide on their future. We frequently get frustrated when efforts at disciplining (teaching) our youth seem not to work and we resort to punishment (hurting). Yet we seem surprised when a youth becomes angry when denied access to meaningful services, education or employment, when youth themselves are victims of violence and abuse, when youth are unhappy or reluctant participants in institutional programs designed by adults. However, youth is still the only minority group from which one has the opportunity to out grow! As a result, there are still few community-based services that meet the needs of adolescents and their families.

A refreshing exception to this is the National Runaway Youth Program. Initiated in the mid 1970's, this program has combined local control and initiative with federal leadership and vision. The goals and objectives of the Runaway Youth Act are broad yet specific, comprehensive yet individualistic. They are also family focused! There is not the time nor need to document the range of program accomplishments, issues, or problems as a result of the Act. However, I do want to highlight after-crisis care and volunteerism.

Huckleberry House sees over 600 youth annually. 75-85% of these youth seek Huckleberry House on their own voluntarily. To do this, besides having a shelter and intake staff (youth, adult and volunteer), we have three full-time Crisis Counselors and one After-Crisis Care Counselor. We received $63,000 from the Youth Development Bureau last year and according to Youth Development Bureau's own research, 75% should be spent in aftercare. This would mean we would have to run the 24 hour crisis program, complete with volunteer training, private sector fund raising, engagement and intake, family reconciliation and shelter on less than $16,000.

The crisis needs of youth require more resources so we had to develop additional funding and experiment with a wide range of aftercare models. One outstanding example was our participation in a demonstration project during 1979-1981. Under the Ohio Youth Services Network, Ohio centers developed state wide aftercare models. At the same time, efforts were made to work with the Ohio Department of Public Welfare to develop future mechanisms, specifically looking at state Title XX money - not unlike the current scramble over block grants. This demonstration effort was funded in part by the Runaway Youth Act. The service models developed were excellent. Unfortunately, however, it was also shown how small unique service oriented community runaway programs would fare under state bureaucratic leadership. There were no new programs funded by the state as a result of two years worth of full-time efforts. There was neither the vision, willingness, nor the money. The Senate Subcommittee should study closely why this project failed to provide move local programs before your previous efforts for youth are given over to the block grant roulette wheel.

This coming September ends another excellent aftercare demonstration project for Huckleberry House. Huckleberry House, the Columbus Children's Hospital, and the League Against Child Abuse developed a multi-disciplinary, inter-agency post-crisis research and service program for maltreated adolescents. Results show that self-referred youth coming to Huckleberry House do not differ from youth seen at the hospital or by the Child Protective Service Agency. However, these runaways coming to Huckleberry House were screened for maltreatment and abuse. Over 70% of all runaways self report significant maltreatment (youth struck with a physical object, youth had used on self or had been threatened with the use of a knife or gun). These examples are the only ones considered. Lesser forms of punishment were not considered.

This shocking preliminary evidence confirms other national findings that adolescents as a group are subject to significant abuse and maltreatment. However, the percentages are higher than expected. Unfortunately, community awareness of this phenomenon and service to this group do not match the need! The Adolescent Maltreatment Project has provided the Huckleberry House crisis staff with an immediately accessible, flexible, high quality after crisis program. As a result, crisis resolution efforts have been developed far beyond "surface" reconciliation. More significant family issues have been explored and resolved, knowing that once issues were raised, help beyond the crisis was available. We feel that the availability of aftercare significantly increases the quality of crisis counseling and emergency shelter!

This Adolescent Maltreatment Demonstration Project was funded as a result of the National Runaway Youth Program. Huckleberry House will have a difficult time providing aftercare without resources. These families and young people are the most difficult to engage and as such are not successfully treated by other agencies. These families have very little disposable, discretionary income - if indeed they are employed in Ohio's economy - and are very reluctant to pay for counseling services for their adolescent. The results will be no service.

Looking further at local resources to fund post crisis aftercare, Franklin County expenditures for human services have decreased over $14 million in the past two years. In spite of this cut to Huckleberry House and others, Huckleberry House has developed extensive volunteer and private sector funding efforts. We are a part of the United Way, perhaps the largest private sector funding program. However, if more federal money is cut, the even more private sector money is simply not available.

Since Huckleberry House's crisis program opened, we have consistently used 30-40 non-paid volunteer staff. To highlight some significant successess in the month of May, thirty-one volunteers provided over 375 hours of donated service. These efforts have been very good at making up for lost and inadequate resources. However, these are continuing efforts.

We have been teaching courses in local high schools in exchange for volunteers. This will expand next year. We are increasingly developing Retired Senior Volunteer Program and Welfare General Relief Workers as special volunteers. We use area colleges and universities for special volunteer/placement positions. These specialized volunteers augment our regular volunteers to produce many hours of time that we could not purchase or provide without their help.

The most significant policy implication of these service issues is the inadequacy of resources for the relatively disenfranchised, isolated group of people. Unless appropriation of $25 million is seriously considered, issues of aftercare and abuse can not be taken seriously. Programs have expanded their service efforts to include homeless youth as well as community runaways. Often, this expansion is because of financial need. Contracts with Juvenile Courts and Child Protective Services are made which limit a program's ability to adequately and equitably serve runaways. Programs shift to serve the needs of homeless youth often result in changes not necessarily compatible with serving runaways. The two groups have different needs. The decrease in self referrals to centers is one possible indication of this shift. The equitability referred to suggests re-structuring and value changes while adequacy refers to the ability or desire to engage runaways, not to mention that the available beds now occupied by homeless youth have replaced runaways. The population of community runaways is an inconsistent, hard to serve group. Homeless youth need more stability and planning time; thus contracts with local funders can provide financial stability to the runaway center. However, these decisions affect service! The Runaway Youth Act has acknowledged the needs of homeless youth in name only. This group was added, but appropriations were not increased.

The equitability formula cuts Ohio's programs. If full funding was considered, this formula would not have hurt Ohio as much. However, Ohio is a state with a disproportionate number of separate urban areas where the needs of adolescents and their families are felt more keenly. If full funding was considered, the population equitability would not be as critical for local programs.

There is a belief that if human service programs worked smarter and used volunteers, we wouldn't feel the federal cuts. In Huckleberry House's twelve year history, we have always used many volunteers. We have always had students from universitites and local high schools. Further cuts, including the Runaway Youth Act's 35% proposed administrative cut, does not challenge us toward private sector funding or volunteers, it threatens our survival. We are already receiving private sector money. We are already using volunteers to the fullest extent. These are not new ideas.

Runaway programs have unique problems. Nationally, the pay scale of line workers is among the lowest. These are very few frills attached to these crisis centers. More cuts threaten the virtual existence of centers which must be either open all the time or closed. Programs can not operate 24 hour emergency services three days a week. You can not serve every other youth or every other need. Programs are either open or closed. Cuts in programs will mean many programs will close. Cut backs mean closed doors. To roll-over runaway programs to block grants simply means that more human service programs will be fighting each other for crumbs. It does not mean eliminating duplication and waste, or local control of runaway centers. The Ohio Youth Services Network's experience with Title XX is a good indication of what may happen.

Huckleberry House is an agency with a twelve year history of service to youth. We have a commitment to service isolated, frightened, angry youth and their equally anxious, frightened parents. Federal leadership is needed to meet the needs of this unique population group. The dollars proposed are such a small investment in such a large future.

Thank you for your time. I am waiting to answer any questions.